Library of the
PACIFIC UNITARIAN SCHOOL
FOR THE MINISTRY
Berkeley, California

THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE

A MAGAZINE OF DEFINITE PROGRESS AND VIRILE OPTIMISM IN RELIGION

"Speak unto this people that they go forward"

SEPT.
1911

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR

SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS

ISSUED FROM THE NEW YORK UNITARIAN HEADQUARTERS. 104 EAST TWENTIETH STREET NEW YORK. THE FIRST DAY OF EACH MONTH

THE CHURCH OF TOMORROW

BY REV. JOSEPH H. CROOKER, D. D., OF ROSLINDALE

What reviewers say about "The Church of Tomorrow":—

On every page the reader comes upon something that arrests attention, that compels him to think for himself. The book deserves the widest reading.—*Boston Herald.*

Dr. Crooker faces the situation fairly and earnestly.... His book is one that will appeal to all men and women who love their church and wish to see it marching forward.—*Boston Traveler.*

The author comes to his task with an open mind, seeking to know the facts, and understanding the spirit and purpose of the Church.... He is not in the least despairing. His outlook is optimistic. —*Boston Transcript.*

"It strikes at the root of things." "Dr. Crooker does not attempt to hide any unpleasant fact about the situation, but faces them candidly and shows how they must be remedied." "The great vital problems which confront the friends of religion and disciples of Jesus are here dealt with in a clear, forcible, and convincing manner." "We wish this suggestive and practical exposition of fundamental principles could be put into the hands of every student graduating from the college into the ministry."

300 PAGES **JUST PUBLISHED** **$1.00 NET**

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE CHURCH OF TODAY

176 PAGES **6,000 COPIES SOLD** **50 CENTS NET**

What reviewers say about this book:—

I have been reading your book with warm interest. It seems to me an admirable and a timely volume.—*George A. Gordon.*

In pithy, pointed, forceful sentences, Mr. Crooker shows the present difficulties which the church faces.—*Pres. George B. Stewart, in Auburn Seminary Record.*

It is on fire with zeal for a renovated, redeemed, and really sanctified church.—*Boston Transcript.*

This is a moderate and candid statement of the problem before the church.—*American Review of Reviews.*

It appeals to men of practice who are well at the front of modern civilization.—*Edward E. Hale, in Lend-a-Hand Record.*

Dr. Crooker's treatise is an earnest assertion of the real necessity of the church for the better service of humanity.—*Springfield Daily Republican.*

The little volume is remarkable both for comprehensiveness and sobriety.—*The Dial.*

THE PILGRIM PRESS - **14 BEACON STREET, BOSTON**
120 SOUTH WABASH AVENUE, CHICAGO

COMMONWEALTH HOTEL

INCORPORATED

OPPOSITE STATE HOUSE, BOSTON, MASS.

Offers rooms with hot and cold water for $1.00 per day and up, which includes free use of public shower baths.

Nothing to Equal This in New England

Rooms with private bath for $1.50 per day and up; suites of two rooms and bath for $4.00 per day and up.

Dining Room and Cafe First-Class European Plan.

Absolutely Fire-Proof

Stone floors, nothing wood but the doors.
Equipped with its own Vacuum Cleaning Plant.
Long Distance Telephone in Every Room.
Strictly a Temperance Hotel.
Send for booklet.

STORER F. CRAFTS,
General Manager

The Water Star

Essays of the out-of-doors; parables of every day life, drawn from the page of Nature, containing **The Water Star, Landscape of the Soul, The Haunts of The Hind,** and **Do We See Nature?**

Cloth, with gracefully illum. cover. 80 cents.

Sea Moods

A dainty collection of Sea Poems, drawing their inspiration chiefly from sojournings at the Isles of Shoals, and the Maine Coast.

In paper. Price 15 cents.

At The Year's High Tide

A little group of Summer-time verses, especially of the hills and the ocean.

In paper, with graceful cover. 25 cents.

BY GEORGE HENRY BADGER

FOR SALE AT

N. Y. Unitarian Headquarters

104 EAST TWENTIETH STREET
NEW YORK

The Unitarian Advance

GEORGE H. BADGER, Editor

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, CHARLES WESLEY CASSON, HENRY WILDER FOOTE, EDGAR SWAN WIERS, FREDERICK ROBERTSON GRIFFIN, ALSON HAVEN ROBINSON.

Contents for September, 1911

Editorials - - - - - - - - - 3

Children of Pioneers - - - - W. Hanson Pulsford 6

Elevating the Stage and Depressing the Public, Walter Prichard Eaton 7

The Atonement That Atones - - - Rev. W. A. Vrooman 11

Quatrains of Compensation - - - - Gwynn Myrick 15

Outside the Breastworks - - - - - - - 16

Our Readers' Exchange - - - - - - - 20
Mr. Holmes is not approved of. (Geo. R. Bishop.)
The Function of the Church,. (T. D. Eliot.)

Loyalty to the Unitarian Faith - - - Rev. F. Blount Mott 24

Religion in Hawaii - - - - E. S. Goodhue, M. D. 26

New Books - - - - - - - - - 29
"Life in the Making," by Loren B. Macdonald; "The Church of Tomorrow" by J. H. Crooker; "Letters to a Ministerial Son" by A Man of the World.

Contributing Editors: Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, of New York; Rev. Jabez T. Sunderland, of Hartford, Conn.; Pres. Franklin C. Southworth, of Meadville, Pa.; Rev. Thomas Van Ness, of Boston; Rev. Wilson M. Backus, of Minneapolis, Minn.

Subscription Price, One Dollar. Send remittance by check or money order, made payable to **THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE, 104 East Twentieth Street, New York.**

Published by **THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE ASSOCIATION:** George H. Badger, President and Treasurer; Edgar S. Wiers, Secretary.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

New York Unitarian Headquarters, 104 East Twentieth Street, New York.

For Ministers Chiefly;—

But Others May be Interested

DO you know that you can help forward the success of THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE better than anyone else?

What is the success of THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE, and why should you care to help, anyway?

Our success lies not chiefly in what we may receive in money returns, (that is incidental;) but in what we can give out in influence for progress and energy of faith.

If we are doing what we have undertaken—and ought to do, our success is your advantage. The more people in your congregation who read THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE, the more vitally alive your church will be,—the more eager their interest in your work, and response to your inspiration.

Do we claim too much? Perhaps. But we have an index. Some churches are largely represented on our subscription list. Others are not. A parallel column exhibit of the two classes heartens us. Why not put your church unmistakably in the alert and wide-awake list,—if not there already?

You can tell your congregation about us; you can ask us to send you a package of sample-copies,—we have them all ready. You can say a good word now and then to individual parishioners.

But don't,—unless you believe that success for THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE means denominational progress, and the spread of essential faith.

Here is a specific thing to announce from the pulpit next Sunday:—Every subscription taken during September will run till January, 1913;—(sixteen months); and if any wide-awake young person in your congregation wishes to be our agent, we offer a commission of twenty-five per cent. Tell the Sunday School about that!

THE PUBLISHERS.

The Unitarian Advance

Formerly The Unitarian *Established 1906* *Old Number, Vol. VI, No. 9*

VOLUME II (NEW SERIES) **SEPTEMBER, 1911** **NUMBER 1**

THE President of the United States has recently signed two notable treaties of arbitration,—with England and with France: the noblest and most far-reaching treaties of "Applied Civilization" the world has ever known. Now they await the ratification of our national Senate. Of course we know what will happen there. Every Senator will be unanimous for the abstract principle of international arbitration, and will avow himself a vehement friend of universal peace; but more than one Senator will discover that while international arbitration treaties in the abstract are splendid and holy things, these particular treaties (like all other particular treaties that ever have or ever will be executed) contain certain provisions (very technical, complex and understandable only to men of profound legislative acumen) which outrage the honor and dignity of the honorable Senate itself as a partner in the treaty-making function, or in some other way involve catastrophe for our national honor and dignity,—and so there will be a fight for their rejection. The more's the pity; but fortunately the moral sense, and the common sense of the people has been aroused on this issue; and there will be formidable impatience manifested toward any Senator who trifles with this opportunity for inspired statesmanship or becomes party to any scheme of postponement for this triumph of the ideal of universal brotherhood and rational peace.

———o———

SO far as the United States is concerned, moreover, the agreement of Reciprocity between this country and Canada is assured: and this we deem a great moral victory. Far be it from us, impractical men of religion as we are, to know too much about the economic issues involved. Perhaps the President's bargain was not the best that could possibly be made from every private interest's peculiar point of view: and possibly as too often happens in American legislation, the farmer suffers most from whatever imperfection the agreement may contain. But though the Reciprocity pact passed may not be ideal in every way, it is far better than no Reciprocity at all: at any rate it is a step toward sanity and the practicability of the Golden Rule in the commercial relations of two neighboring nations. Now may we hope that the wisdom of Canada will match the wisdom of the United States in generous good will. Most of all may we hope (and feel confident) that nothing so stupid and immoral shall happen as the defeat of the proposition by a politician's scare that Reciprocity is a veiled advance toward annexation. From our own view-point nothing more unfortunate could happen either to Canada or the United States, than the absorption of the Dominion by the Union. The imperial destiny of Canada seems to us one of the most significant and wholesome factors of New World development that could possibly be conceived, and any scheme of annexation would dwarf and hinder the largeness of that possibility. Few statesmen if any, on this side of the line, have any dream of extending our borders in that way. But however that may be, the people of Canada have better wisdom, and more robust moral poise, we suspect, than to permit a politician's scare-cry to prevent for them the triumph of a noble ideal of international comity and industrial good-will.

———o———

DID we do Gov. Dix of New York injustice in our editorial comments of last month? Perhaps. For since that writing the New York legislature has adjourned, and the Governor has had a very busy time vetoing bills of unrighteousness and folly enacted by that astounding body, elected on the wave of

a great national impulse of reform. Gov. Dix has done very well; he has fearlessly vetoed a large number of such bills: he has saved the State's treasury from costly raids: he has saved the State's honor from ignoble stains. And this is good, so far as it goes. But this is negative. Where have there been indications of one sturdy step of robust achievement for social advancement and civic righteousness forwarded at the Governor's leadership? We do not speak as a partizan or one interested in politics as such. But all about us is growing a more insistent ideal of civic leadership, a more exacting standard of public service, and a finer impatience with merely negative political integrity, which it is well to heed, and with which all forces of religion have vital concern. Men who put religious idealism and ethical zest into their interest in public affairs, just now, are focussing their attention wholesomely on the acheivements of conspicuous leaders. It is easier to watch Presidents than Congressmen, Governors than legislatures, and Mayors than city councils; and so the stress of personal responsibility is becoming more and more keen upon those who hold positions where personal qualities of leadership can command and direct. This is wholesome and redeeming,—if only shall go with it a growing sense of one's own personal responsibility on the part of the private citizen himself, for the issues nearest at hand. The party-stalled Congress and the corrupt State legislature are simply products of the corrupt city government and local machine,—and local church people can easily get at those if they will only try. The average citizen suffers more actual hurt each year from the misdoings of his own near neighbors on local boards and councils than from the mischief of national mal-administrations and State crookedness, but accepts it more complaisantly because its evil is not so dramatic. We are glad to note that in so many of our churches the custom is growing for our Men's Clubs to make it a part of their club responsibility to become acquainted with the real facts relating to local government, and to become efficient in their betterment. May the habit grow!

———o———

LET everybody get busy in the enterprise of making the next National Unitarian Conference, to be held in Washington, October 23-26, a very *real* event. That means, let every church take pains to be well represented there, *paying the expenses of its minister and delegates,* and seeing to it that genuine representatives are sent as its delegates. That means that every minister shall become more than quiescently concerned about the success of the enterprise,—shall put himself out to *talk the Conference up,* quicken the interest of his people, publicly and by private interviews, in the vital worth of such gatherings. This means that our lay-people wait not at all for their ministers' promptings, but assume themselves the responsibility of arousing the loyalty of their co-workers to make this "enterprise of togetherness" amongst our churches a tingling reality of enthusiasm:—and beyond all else of course, that means that everybody —ministers, lay-delegates, workers of any sort in any place of our activity, who can go to Washington at all, go there with determination to make the thing worth while, after they get there:—positively and aggressively constructive, progressive and accumulative of denominational strength and inspiration.

———o———

THE program as prepared is on the whole a strong one,—potentially; its actual strength will be revealed in what our people themselves shall make of it, when they are through with listening to inspiring addresses and get down to the resolute business of "conferring," i. e. of discussing. Undoubtedly the most salient feature in the program as published is that extended, carefully wrought out, and (we had almost said) laboriously re-assuring gloss on the "Sociological Program." Perhaps the makers of this program worried a bit over this detail of their architecture; and well they might! These are days when it would be unpardonable to dodge the issues of social unrest. If the church has any business

anywhere it must lie somewhere near the storm-center of the social problem; and the devisors of this program want us all to heed that this issue is not to be evaded in Washington. "It is the desire of the council that the Conference may turn to most effective use in the Unitarian Church the constantly swelling tide of purpose to make religion and the church most serviceable in the cause of human betterment." That's worth while! Only mark you, there are the nerves of sensitive people to be considered; there must be no wrangling over things we don't all agree upon; there must be no chance for bomb-shells of dismay from the restless and erratic young men of our communion who have such disagreeable ways of saying nerve-racking things about the Church, the State, Big Business and the "Proletariat;" therefore—let us concentrate our attention painstakingly through the hours of this vital discussion, on the edifying subject of "the principle of inspection for standardizing social conditions"; for on that subject we shall all agree—we shall all be docilely open to instruction, and we shall all be tranquil as to our nerves. Now mind you, we believe heartily in the principle of inspectorship, and we believe in "standardizing social conditions," and we believe in tranquil nerves,—and we genuinely believe that the program prepared for Wednesday morning will prove very interesting and useful and productive of good; it is, we are sure, a very sensible program—painstakingly sensible, in fact; and yet—we wonder what will actually happen!

———o———

IF true Unitarians could have their way, there would be no Unitarian churches. Of course. And this does not mean either, that with complaisant bigotry we would be satisfied were all churches so unanimously Unitarian in substance of doctrine that the distinction of our name would no longer be necessary. That is not the point. We would be willing to maintain a modest part in a Holy Church Universal in which a majority of the people still held views persistently different from our own; we would be content to worship in congregations where our theological point-of-view, and even our pet notions about ecclesiastical polity, had little recognition, could we honestly have our part in a great world movement of religion in which correct theological conviction was not deemed a requisite to salvation, and wherein the right of the individual soul to think otherwise, and speak otherwise than the majority as to dogmas and creedal confessions was recognized as inalienable and divine—and more than that as essential to vital progress in religious things.

———o———

Herein, of course, lies the essence of the Unitarian ideal. Put in another and more significant way—the Unitarian church stands separate from other churches, not because it believes in separation, or wants to separate, but because it alone admits the principle of *progress* into its manner of being. This sounds arrogant, undoubtedly. A monopoly on progress, forsooth! Is not every church of every name, today, clamorous in its zest for progress, its eager enthusiasm for advance? This is quaintly true. The splendid humor of the present religious situation lies in the resolute endeavor of progress-enamored men of every creed and communion to re-interpret dogmas rigorously framed by the fathers to exclude the possibility of human progress in religious knowledge—dogma of inerrant scripture, dogma of human depravity, dogma of the supernatural nature of redemption and the like, in such fashion that the modern ideals of development and normal growth through human investigation and experience can be let in. We speak not with contempt of such inconsistency: for persistent inconsistency has been the saving of the nations from the very beginning of things. The instinct of progress is alive in every religious body in the world today; and in certain ways Unitarians lag rather than lead in the full assertion of this instinct.

———o———

BUT the Unitarian's point of distinction is just this:—we believe in conscience in religion, and we have a prejudice for the straight thing in intellectual

veracity. Our churches cost money—but we would close them all tomorrow morning: our traditions are honorable and we know how to be very proud of ourselves in the light of what has been:—but we would agree to wipe the whole story out, and reduce our pride to rags of humility, provided we could find our place in a great Church Universal—in which a man's right to think his own thought, and pray his own prayer, and speak his own conviction shall stand as God's consecrated way of leading his humanity on to holier faiths and stronger ideals, and in which the bond of union shall lie, not in creed confession, but a purpose of righteousness focussed to faithful endeavor. All the churches are moving toward that ideal: and meanwhile we in our churches are clarifying our own convictions as to that ideal; but there is nothing that Unitarianism means that inherently or historically is of any consequence at all, which is not exactly identical with that ideal. Which of course, may sound to alien ears dangerously near to saying that the only Church Universal must be a Unitarian church:—but what of that?

———o———

CHILDREN OF PIONEERS.

By W. Hanson Pulsford.

It may be a great thing to come of noble ancestry. Retrospection, when it is not what retrospection sometimes is, a mark of senility and decay, may be an inspiration. But few are so pitiable as the puny and listless children of a noble ancestry.

It is in that sense alone that the names of our fathers, names like those of Channing and Parker and Martineau, are names to conjure with. But the sword and sandals of his father belonged to Theseus only when he, in the strength he had inherited, lifted the stone which withheld them from the weaker men of Troezene. The glory of ancestry is not the reflected light of ancestral deeds but the inherited inspiration of the spirit which ennobled. The children of the Channings of the world are not those who boast that they stand on the vantage ground which the great pioneers won, but those who are in turn pioneers in the realm of life as Channing was.

It is not well for us to nurture a complacent content that a long list of noble names is enrolled under the banner which we ought to bear unless that banner in our hands is where they set it, in the van of the battle for wider truth and nobler living.

What made men like Channing and Parker and Martineau great was that in their own day and in relation to their own time they were men who sought and found new and living inspiration in the van of human progress. They were men who were not afraid to abandon the positions their fathers had won for higher ground where in due time the children of the men that scoffed at them should encamp in safety.

Those alone are loyal to their memory who inherit their spirit, who like them look ever forward and living as they lived in the inspiration of growing truth find in our own time fresh and larger vision of God as they did in theirs.

There is no disloyalty so great as disloyalty to the spirit of the very men we claim to honor; to rest with folded hands while all around us a new heaven and a new earth are opening to those who have eyes to see and courage to attempt. Progress did not end with the mighty pioneers of the Unitarian movement. Their cry to us is that we like them be ever in the van of intellectual liberty, winning for ourselves, as they won it, the vital energy of deeper experience of the divine possibilities of life. Holmes' "Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul," might well have been their motto, as it must be that of those who claim kinship with them. The work to which such as they call men is never done. We do but "level one lift" to pass on to another and a higher. Those alone whose eyes are on the dawn beyond the hills of God and whose faith is the radiant faith in which their fathers lived are the true children of the pioneers.

Elevating the Stage, and Depressing the Public

BY WALTER PRICHARD EATON,

Author of "The New Theatre and Others," Etc.

IN a recent issue of Success Magazine I saw announced an article entitled "Those Good Old Days of the Drama." Knowing the man who wrote it, I was a little surprised that he should have entered, at his thirtieth year, into his anecdotage. But I turned from the table of contents to the article itself, and there found this sub-title: "Why our stage isn't what it used to be—and why it never was"—a sentiment that deserves almost to rank with Oscar Wilde's "Meredith is a prose Browning—and so is Browning."

This is not to say that the stage is all right at the present time. This is not to say that the efforts of all the well-meaning folk who would be elevating it are vain and misdirected. It is merely to clear the ground of one unfortunately too common argument for the attempts at elevation—the argument that the stage is not what it once was, and therefore its elevation should take the form of a re-creation of past conditions.

This argument does not always come into the open. But those of us who have labored however humbly at the task of bettering stage conditions in America know only too well its various subtle manifestations. Perhaps the most common of these manifestations is the opposition to the sociological, or problem plays of the modern theatre. It can hardly be questioned, for instance, that William Winter loves the theatre in its best estate, and desires honestly and earnestly its "elevation." Yet Mr. Winter has led the opposition to the modern drama with all the weapons of satire and invective at his command. If we analyze the reasons for his opposition, we find them to be based on the fetish of taboo—certain subjects should not be mentioned on the stage, not because they lack interest or importance, but because, one is tempted to say, they possess interest and importance, because they are closely related to the facts and problems of contemporary life. The dramatic repertoire of Mr. Winter's youth was either far removed from its present, being composed of Elizabethan classics or blank verse imitations of those classics, or it was composed of more contemporary plays built entirely to entertain by a romantic story. Therefore it is utterly incredible to Mr. Winter and hundreds, or rather thousands, of good men and women like him, that anybody should wish to see plays in the theatre which are neither classics nor romances, but studies of contemporary life.

A writer today who takes himself seriously, and who desires to be taken seriously, no less in the drama than the novel, seeks to do more than to entertain by a romantic story. He seeks to do more than to send his audience home "better and happier," in the sense implied by that phrase in the writing of such older critics as Mr. Winter. He seeks not so much to make his audiences better as to make better the conditions amid which his audience live, by making his audiences pay a more thoughtful attention to those conditions. Ibsen so strove in Scandinavia. Brieux, the foremost dramatist of France, so strives in that country. In England we have recently seen a whole prison system affected for the better, thanks to Mr. Galsworthy's play of "Justice." Something of the same sociological passion lay behind Eugene Walter's play, "The Easiest Way," which that eminent guardian of the public morals and defender of the public taste, Honey Fitz, mayor of Boston, forbade to play in the city of Garrison and Wendell Phillips. The same passion underlies the plays of Joseph Patterson, "The Fourth Estate" and "Rebellion." Even so fanciful a writer and incorrigible a humorist as J. M. Barrie has felt it. His "Admiral Crichton" was an ironic social study of the caste system in England, and his most recent play, "The Twelve Pound Look," is a bitter arraignment of the modern workshop of material success.

Now it so happens that an author who writes with an honest and earnest purpose to make a significant, thoughtful commentary on the life about him, in a serious or tragic drama, does not feel drawn to picture what is already happy and hopeful. He depicts what is unhappy and in need of remedy. Naturally his plays are often "unpleasant." But the critics who mourn the decline of the drama, in one breath attack him because of the "unpleasantness" of his plays and attack the stage because of its neglect of tragedy. Now tragedy in the modern drama is not, and cannot be, what tragedy was in the ancient classics. The modern tragedy is not death, but life, not a sudden taking off, but a dull continuation of living. In the Greek and Elizabethan drama the end was slaughter. We did not need a Maeterlinck to tell us that today that is not the tragic ending. There is something primitive, archaic, about ancient tragedy, as primitive as ancient modes of justice and violence.

In other words, the modern dramatist, seeking to write what corresponds to ancient tragedy, is driven by the very conditions of the modern world about which he writes to find his tragic material in the tyrannies and misfortunes and economic evils of the life surrounding him, and to give this material the uplift and "purging effect" of tragedy not by the employment of verse, not by the grand Miltonic manner, but by the unerring truth of his picture, the sincerity, earnestness and ethical passion of his narration.

This, then, explains why all movements to "elevate the stage" have quite as much to fear from the aid of the older generation as they have from the silent opposition of the public at large. The older generation wish to elevate the stage by putting it back where it was when they were young. The public does not want it put back; it cannot be put back. Like everything else in this world, it must go forward along the lines of its natural, logical evolution. It must interest the new generation. It must answer the needs of the new generation. It must be abreast of the public of its day. You cannot elevate the stage by depressing the public.

It is, therefore, plain that any attempt to elevate the stage must first take account of the public taste and temper, and instead of striving to produce plays contrary to that taste and temper, or to forbid plays which are according to it, the effort toward elevation should be directed along the lines of improving this taste. Anything else invites failure.

For instance, it can hardly be denied that the poorer classes have a pronounced taste and temper for moving pictures and vaudeville. Indeed, there are twenty moving picture theatres to every two or three houses where dramas are presented by living actors, and the audiences at the canned dramas, or moving pictures, outnumber the audiences at the so-called first-class houses ten to one. If, then, we mean by elevating the stage not alone improving the quality of the literary drama, but bettering conditions in the entire range of the play-house, a very large part of our job lies not on Broadway but the back streets, not in the Empire Theatre but in the moving picture shows.

On the whole, at the present time there is not much ground for complaint against the moving pictures themselves. The manufacturers have steadily tried to improve the artistic and ethical grade of their films. But there is ground for complaint against the stupid and often coarse vaudeville which is interpolated between pictures, and still more for the stupid, coarse and frequently rather base entertainments of the burlesque and variety houses. To combat such "shows" by a better grade of entertainment at prices as low or lower, in theatres equally attractive and conveniently situated, is an obvious weapon. But where are these theatres to come from? The settlements do what they can, by giving amateur performances of Shakespeare, etc., and the city schools are coming to realize the value of pageants, and even of plays. But all such things are but a drop in the bucket. The theatre is a form of recreation, and a popular form. To be effective over the mass of people, it must blaze with light, it must be capable of holding

throngs, it must stand as a regular institution of the neighborhood. We venture to say that a municipal theatre seating 1,500 people in the poorer part of Boston, of New York, of Chicago or any large city where moving pictures were regularly shown a part of the day at the ordinary rates, children's plays presented for ten cents on certain afternoons, and good adult drama given in the evening at prices to compete with the vaudeville houses about, would be full all the time, and would exert a vast influence for good.

When we come to the problem of the so-called first-class theatres, the field of effort for the newly founded drama leagues of Chicago, Boston and elsewhere, we have again to take into consideration the taste and temper of the public, for without such consideration we can do no effective work whatever. Whoever we are, however high-brow, as the phrase goes, however much we are bored by musical comedy or thrilled by Ibsen, we have to remember that the mass of theatre-goers attend the playhouse exactly as the poor do—for recreation; and the one absolutely fatal thing is to bore them. They are entitled, too, to their recreation as much as you and I to ours. I say you and I to ours—but I am by no means sure that any eclectic body of choice dramatic spirits really exists, even among the professing ranks of the drama leaguers. Most of us like a musical comedy—I am sure I do. Most of like a farce. Most of us occasionally enjoy a bit of vaudeville. To try to prohibit such entertainments is about as sensible as to try to swim up Niagara. Recreation to a great mass of American theatre-goers means just this sort of thing, and not the higher recreation of following an absorbing and truthful depiction of life.

American parents are chiefly to blame, I have often thought, for the quantity of inane musical comedy on our stage. Every one of us here has heard time and time again the silly, vapid songs from these "shows" sung in the family circle. The Sunday newspapers pass them around as sheet music. They lie on the pianos of our homes. They are practically the only vocal music known in thousands and thousands of American households. If the drama leagues just now so actively conducted by our women's clubs wish to do a good turn toward elevating musical comedy, let them conduct a campaign to burn all the sheet music from these shows found in their communities, and to encourage in the homes the singing of good songs. Unless a young person has acquired a taste for good music and the power to discriminate between good and bad, it is absurd to ask him to discriminate between operetta and trash.

When we come to the highest form of dramatic art, to the drama and comedy which assume to depict life or the farces which aspire to literary form, we come, in the narrower sense, to the true problem of elevating the stage—I say the true problem, because here we face directly at last the problem of creating for a nation a conscious drama, a body of stage literature, which shall reflect the life of the nation and aid it to self-consciousness and critical balance. And here again we are confronted with the fact that the higher drama, exactly like the moving-picture shows of the masses, if exploited commercially for the profit of the individuals, depends entirely upon the laws of supply and demand, and is entirely beyond our direct control, except in cases of police regulation. Since there seems no immediate—nor even remote—hope that the stage in America will be controlled otherwise, our one chance of bettering conditions is by organized encouragement.

It is organized encouragement which the various drama leagues of Chicago, Boston and elsewhere have started out to supply. Their mission is a noble one, but their success is as yet problematic. The theatre depends for its audiences on women more than on men—about 70 per cent of the audiences at the legitimate drama are said to be women. The drama league movement started among women, and is largely supported by women. If this movement is to spread wide enough visibly to affect our theatres we very much fear that a totally new standard of judgment in theatrical matters will have to be created among a great many women. The object of the drama

leagues is merely to recommend, through bulletins sent out by a central committee, certain dramas which are worthy of patronage, and thus by the attendance of the members of the league at the plays, to encourage the managers to mount such dramas in preference to the cheaper sort. The league's object is thus seen to be constructive, not destructive. It does not assume to censor anybody's pleasure, or to interfere with the stage high-handedly. It seeks only to build up an organized encouragement for worthy plays.

The most effective work for the elevation of the stage is being done today in our colleges, especially in Harvard and Yale. There the drama is treated as a serious branch of fine arts, and not alone the drama of the printed page, but of the practical play-house. So highly is it thought of at Harvard, indeed, that a specific course is offered to teach the highly technical subject of professional play-construction. It is not to be expected that this course will produce numerous playwrights any more than the more general composition courses produce shoals of novelists and poets. But it has already produced some playwrights, and not only does it increase in all men who take it the knowledge and understanding of the stage, but, by its mere presence in the curriculum of Harvard College, it adds to the dignity of the drama as an art, it nspires increased respect for the drama in all students.

The more freedom and encouragement you grant to our dramatists to treat of any and all subjects which interest them, the more likely they are to produce plays which will have the stamp of sincerity, and interest the mass of men and women.

That is why, before we can have again a stage where the works of Shakespeare and other classic writers are frequently performed by great artists, before we can have whimsey and poetry, we must have stark realism. The drama must be made to seem near to life, it must be made to seem vital and important. Primarily, it is entertainment. But to be entertaining to the mass of people in its highest manifestations, these people must respect it. It is more important today to encourage the plays of Augustus Thomas on the American stage than the plays of Ibsen or Shakespeare, because the plays of Mr. Thomas are closer to us.

What the stage suffers from, what it suffered from in the palmy days, what it always will suffer from, is, first, the frivolity and the taste for sentimental mediocrity in a large part of the public, and, sceond, the ignorant, self-seeking, often vulgar men who control the physical side of the playhouse—the theatrical managers.

There is one way, and one way only, to alter this condition, and that is the way of esthetic education. The real time to begin is with the child; the place, in the school and the home. It is an important work, we are only just realizing how important. It means not only an improvement in taste for the drama, but for all art, literature and life.

The second standing affliction of the stage, the character of the men, not who act upon it or who write for it but who manage it as a commercial venture, who exploit pleasure for profit, is, we may freely admit, somewhat more oppressive at present in America than elsewhere, and perhaps than in the past even in this country.

Over these conditions you and I have absolutely no control. The theatre is exploited commercially, and we, so long as we permit it, must put up with a commercial rule. Because it is the manager's desire to make money, however, we get on the stage pretty much what we want, if not always what we ought to have. Ultimately, most writers of worth secure recognition, and the drama survives its unfavorable surroundings. But the quality of stage management, in the narrow sense of training actors and mounting the plays, could be greatly improved, the path could be made easier for new authors, the classics could be more frequently and favorably presented, and finally, the American drama could be crystallized around a leader, by the establishment of an endowed playhouse, which should be conducted not commercially, but artistically, and which should, by its acceptance of a play by a native author, put the stamp of cultured and wise approval on his work, crowning him. as

it were, like the French Academy. Until we realize the need of such a theatre, and establish it on the right lines, not on the lines of ignorant snobbishness of the New Theatre in New York, we may find fault with the commercial managers to the top of our bent, but we shall be wasting breath. All that remains for us is to see to it that we and our children have such a respect for the stage, and such an understanding of dramatic art, that the good plays are patronized, and the poor ones ignored.

Editor's Note:—This paper was read at "The Isles of Shoals Unitarian Summer Meetings" and afterwards printed in the Boston Evening Transcript, from whose columns we now reproduce it.

The Atonement That Atones

By Rev. W. A. Vrooman,

Minister of the Unitarian Church of Winnipeg, Manitoba.

ACCORDING to the "plan of salvation," which is preached as a divine revelation, all men are born under condemnation to death and hell. This sentence could not be reversed until some equivalent for it had been suffered and accepted. By providing this equivalent within the society of persons in the Godhead, it is said God reveals his redeeming love. One Person leaves his rank and by miraculous birth becomes a unique being—a God-man—that by his holy life and violent death he might remove the obstacles between sinful men and divine grace. Those who accept his blood and righteousness as the sole ground of divine mercy and believe they are saved by this plan, are saved, while all others perish. In the words of John Wesley, who fastened this doctrine forever on Methodism, "God undertakes on one only condition to remit the punishment due to our sins and to reinstate us in His favor and restore our dead souls to spiritual life." That essential condition is "not only an assent to the whole gospel of Christ but also a full reliance on the blood of Christ, a trust in the merits of his life and death." Further, "There is no justification without this faith and so long as man believeth not that condemnation cannot be removed, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

This plan of salvation at one time seemed to be perfectly reasonable. It fitted into the scheme of things as they were understood. When astrology, magic, divination and exorcism commanded the belief of the most powerful minds as profound sciences, rational ways of explaining certain phenomena, the orthodox plan of salvation would present no appearance of absurdity. But with increase of knowledge, the old conceptions give place to new. Thus the theology of one age becomes untenable in the next, not because it *has been* irrational or unscientific but because it *has become* so by the discovery of facts hitherto unknown. The dogmas of Christianity in the early centuries of the church were quite harmonious with the science and philosophy of the times. They were developed into a system that was an intellectual masterpiece. Compared with religious systems contemporaneous with its origin, it is strikingly sane and reasonable. Some of the grandest products of ancient philosophy were built into the system. Nor has it lost its power to convince men of large attainments that, although vague and incomprehensible, it still is essentially true and reasonable. It ceases to be reasonable only to those who knowing the facts of modern science and Biblical criticism find it inadequate and unsound.

The doctrine of blood atonement has presented many points of difficulty which are familiar to all students. As commonly taught it is founded on a fear of divine justice. Why should we fear? Shall not the judge of all the earth do right? Will he expect harvests where no seed was sown or wisdom where no common sense was given or holiness in a

slum waif? Shall we think the bleeding wounds of Jesus may arrest the severity of divine judgments and not expect that the bleeding wounds of suffering humanity will effectually plead for justice? If by the force of divine autocracy the justice of God could be established on the earth would men have cause to fear? On the contrary, the mass of mankind would think that heaven's glory had dawned. The greatest difficulty in ethics is to reconcile the conditions of life with faith in the administrative justice of God. A sense of injustice embitters the hearts of men. They feel that while God may have much to forgive, that there is much to be made right with them. They pray with Omar

O Thou, who man of baser earth didst make
And ev'n with Paradise devise a snake
For all the sin wherewith the face of man
Is blackened, Man's forgiveness give, —and take."

The doctrine of atonement has served to emphasize an important truth. It has shown that the administration of justice by a God whose supreme law is love, is not so simple as at first it appears to be. The arbitrary method of showing mercy to those who believe in the efficacy of the precious blood of Jesus leaves a vague sense of injustice, where it does not raise an indignant protest. If on the other hand all idea of atonement is abandoned and sinful men obtain an easy pardon from a good-natured God there is an equal sense of injustice. The ethical problems involved are not easy of solution.

The difficulty, however, is not exactly where our orthodox friends are inclined to find it. They find in sin an offence against God, a debt incurred to the Infinite Holiness. Hence atonement must be made to the offended majesty of Heaven. As men were incompetent to heal the breach it has been regarded as the marvellous revelation of Divine mercy that out of the depths of the Godhead should emerge a Person of the rank of Deity, whose incarnate life and death should make it possible for God to treat with rebellious men and instead of destroying them be gracious to them for the sake of the Infinite sacrifice of his Son. But so far as sin is an offence to God and renders men obnoxious to his holiness there seems no valid reason why he should not freely forgive the penitent. Jesus taught men to pray "forgive us as we forgive those who trespass against us." Yet those who believe that a great barrier existed between them and God and that it is removed as soon as they believe Jesus died to remove it, become unconscious of any guilt before God as as soon as they believe. Their faith gives them peace. Mental agitation subsides in the presence of a belief that all ground of alarm has ceased. The same psychological peace will follow faith in any scheme that satisfies a devotee that the God, who was angry, has become his friend.

But sin is not a matter that rests between man and God only. It is not a private concern that can be settled by an amicable arrangement. It is not blotted out by merely believing that it is. Men are part of a social organism in which every transgression of moral law injures someone. The laws of God are for the protection of men's highest interests, for the perfecting of their lives through obedience and for the increase of their total happiness. They who sin in the exercise of moral freedom, inflict injury on others and on society as a whole. The justice of God is not concerned about the protection of his own rights but with the administration of his own laws among men. The king's justice is for the sake of society and not for the sake of the throne. How then can the Almighty who is pledged to justice forgive men the wrongs they have perpetrated on their fellow men? That is the central problem of Atonement. In antiquity when there was practically nothing of what is now called the social conscience this problem did not press for attention. Sin was a thing of private concern between men and God and so was salvation. Atonement must be made to God and when he was satisfied the whole subject was closed. A man might be saved and rejoice in the mercy of God without any consideration of the wrongs he had inflicted on others and without much

sense of the just rights of other men. Where there did exist this sense of the social justice it was dulled and quickly obliterated by a sacredotal theology that promised reprieve, pardon and salvation to all who believed that in the sacrifice of Jesus was a finished atonement that reconciled God to man.

With the modern quickening of the social conscience the old theology becomes as obsolete as the kabbala. The world is groaning beneath the accumulated injuries inflicted on the race by generations of hard and selfish men. The vices, crimes and greed of the dead smite with a curse the children born yesterday. Pitfalls and snares are set in every street. The evil men do is followed by loss and sorrow and degradation in other lives. Such is the solidarity of society that every evil act is like the disease germ introduced into the body, it will multiply and poison the entire organism. The debt incurred by a sinful man is to other men whose troubles he has increased. Who shall pay it? He has done wrong to his fellows for his own pleasure or profit and how shall it be made right? Justice demands a recompense. Suppose he repents and asks God to forgive him, then must he remember that God is an administrator of justice and as such, cannot release him until atonement is made to humanity for the wrongs he has inflicted on the world. Suppose God should simply forgive and blot out all the man's transgressions without consideration of the evil and sorrow he has caused in the world, there would be clemency but the sufferers of the wrong done would still with justice demand some reparation of the evil done. They demand atonement in the name of justice. How then can God forgive sin until he himself takes the sinner's place and assumes responsibility for reparation either by himself or his agents? Must he not assume the sinner's debts, become surety for his future conduct, and prepare to follow to the end the influences for evil and misery spreading from that life down to the remotest bounds of time? The real atonement then would be not something God had done or would do to appease his own wrath or to remove a technical difficulty out of the way of his free grace, but would be something he is doing in history to make reparation to the injured for the misdeeds of the guilty. That he allows sin to continue can only be explained by the fact of its necessity in the evolution of mankind out of animalism into free moral personalities. The suffering entailed is corrective and reformatory and part of the discipline of life. But behind all we conceive to be the Divine Spirit bearing the burdens of humanity and confident of such final victory that all men will rejoice both in his justice and his love. In the Atonement he pledges himself to satisfy all claims of men to justice in order that he may show mercy to the penitent.

A certain man had two sons. One of them smoked cigarettes and the other could not tell a cigarette from a cinnamon stick. Although promised a flogging if he should smoke, the first boy went into a neighbor's hay loft to indulge. The barn and a valuable horse were burned, and the boy barely escaped with his life, severely scorched. The incensed father remembered the promised flogging but the boy had scarcely enough sound skin to whip, so the father relented. As the boy wept, the father said he would forgive him if the neighbor's boys should soundly thrash his brother. This plan would leave untouched the most important part of the business. What about the man who lost a horse and stable? If the father has deep sense of justice and also is prepared to be merciful to his unfortunate boy, he may forgive him as an act of grace, and settle with the man he has injured as an act of justice. He makes atonement not by providing a way for the boy to escape punishment but when he assumes the rebuilding of the barn and the purchase of a new horse. If I rob Peter to pay Paul and God forgives me for the sake of Jesus who never robbed anyone how does that help Peter? It will help him only as God becomes his security for the reparation of the wrong that has been done.

Some recognition of this principle is found in the Hebrew law. In the fifth and sixth chapters of Leviticus it is en-

acted that if a man by fraud or theft or lying injures another and desires divine mercy, he must make full restitution plus twenty per cent and then offer an unblemished ram as a sacrifice to God and atonement will be made and forgiveness extended.

This is precisely what a truly penitent man desires. He would pay any forfeit in order to undo the wrong that had been done. He recognizes the just debt that he owes to those whom he has injured. But the popular plan of salvation blurs and represses this healthy instinct of conscience and causes him to think of his sins as failures which can be settled with God without recognizing any social obligations. He is led to consider the whole evil business of his life settled when he believes that Jesus' blood and righteousness protect him from the wrath of God and assure him of salvation.

We can readily believe that he who experiences true penitence and receives the regenerating grace of the Spirit will be impelled to make such reparation as he can for the evil he has done. But there are unexplored remainders to the best of lives which a man cannot reach. And how can the seducer, the drunkard, the murderer or the liar overtake and repair the wrongs they have committed? It would seem that when God undertakes to forgive sin he must undertake to finally conquer sin and to make reparation to all who have suffered from the guilt of others. At the point where the resources of men fail to make reparation there must the resources of God come into action.

From this point of view the Atonement is in the realm of free Spiritual Life what Evolution is in the sphere of physical forces. It is the method by which God gradually unfolds His plans and reaches the end in view. It has to do not with the energies we call physical, but with the inner world of the Spirit. It is a process reaching through ages of ages whose currents we may feel and know but whose depths are unfathomable. The world is too small a stage for the drama and an earthly life too short to exhaust its meanings. The consciousness of such a divine process in the Spiritual Life is a great call to surrender our lives to the Divine Will that we may become part of the eternal Atonement.

They who do thus enter with sympathetic consecration into this Spiritual Life are forgiven not because of the blood of Jesus but because God comes with them under the burden of their guilt and pledges Himself to the reparation of their faults. He becomes security for their debts and will see that they are paid. In the actual life into which they are introduced they become colaborers with God and agents through which the Spirit of the Atonement introduces righteousness and pustice among men. They cease from burdening humanity with their sins and become burden bearers and blessings to the world. They manifest the Christ-Spirit, which is divine whether seen in Jesus or in other men. They enter into the service of man to repair the wrongs done by the sins of others. They have not created the slum, the brothel, the barroom or caused the destitution of the unemployed but they feel in their hearts the divine impulse to repair and restore, to pour forth their lives in glad sacrifice for the cure of the world's sins and miseries. If God has forgiven the guilty who caused affliction, He is also discharging their debt to man through all the ministries of self-sacrificing love and all the labors of those who toil for social justice. God is in man reconciling the world unto Himself, meeting the demands of justice while at the same time showing mercy to the evil. The death of Christ was but one incident in the atonement and shows that they who unite with God against the greed of men will suffer loss. All who abide in the love of God and seek for mercy must forgive and be merciful and enlist for the conquest of evil and of all its consequences. They become like Jesus, agents of the Atonement, which will not be complete until the last suffering and sinful soul shall enter into the joy of his Lord.

No man should think lightly of evil. He who does wrong faces the inexorable moral government of God. He will meet the terrible necessity of bitter penitence and humiliating reparation. More than

that he must throw himself on the mercy of God to secure the divine resources for the reparation that lies beyond his power. When God accepts him as a servant and son, he must become an active agent of the Spirit for the overthrow of evil and the establishment of just and right relations among men. His life becomes more than simply moral and good, it becomes a consecrated life, a Spiritual Life having a definite place in the work of God. He becomes not merely a Christian but also in his degree, a Christ, a man through whom the Spirit of God, the Father who is in all and through all and over all, is meeting the sin of the world with redeeming love, overcoming evil with good and finding remedies for the poverty, injustice, oppression, ignorance and sorrow that crush humanity. We need a sociological theory of the Atonement instead of the old theological dogmas.

———o———

QUATRAINS OF COMPENSATION.

By Gwynn Myrick.

I. *A Change of Luck.*

Once wealth was his, lavish his acres spread;
Then came the stinging blow of Fate's harsh rod;
Stripped of his all, he humbly toiled for bread:
"Good luck!" quoth he. *"Now I am rich toward God!"*

II. *The Woe Escaped.*

Racked with sore pain, through years that could not speed,
She lay upon her bed, a soul confined;
My lips with comfort spoke,—she did not need:—
"I know no pain of friends that are unkind!"

III. *Twilight for Hearing.*

Her ears were stopt, no music to them rang;
And hushed for her all sound of earth's accord;
I pitying came: lo, sweet her spirit sang:
"My gain: I better hear the songs of God."

IV. *Faith's Recompense.*

Faith had been sweet to him,—he trusted well:
What Bible spoke for truth, forever so:
Then came the skeptic's touch; the old faiths fell:
"But now," said he, *"I watch Truth's Bible grow."*

V. *Love Dieth Not.*

Death cruel struck, and heart's best loved was gone;
All his soul's wealth to God's strange wrath seemed given.
How could I solace?—Pity met brave scorn:
"Thus to have loved was wondrous gift of God!"

VI. *Without Compensation.*

Vast was her wealth, and she was witching fair:
Her husband nobly loved,—world's darling she.
But no child came—no compensation there:
"I cannot understand: God pity me!"

———o———

—Write it on your heart that every day is the best day in the year. No man has learned anything rightly until he knows that every day is doomsday. Today is a King in disguise. Today always looks mean to the thoughtless, in the fact of an uniform experience that all good and great and happy actions are made up precisely of these blank todays. Let us not be so deceived; let us unmask the King as he passes.—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Outside the Breastworks

EDITOR'S NOTE:—*This article was put into our hands over a year ago by a Unitarian minister who, having identified his Unitarianism with somewhat radical views of social progress suffered some of the "glories of martyrdom" and found himself quickly "outside the breastworks." His vigorous utterances herein contained at any rate present a point of view not without interest to all liberals, however much they may agree or disagree with the writer. We find it interesting also to state that without changing his views or his manner of expressing them, this minister is now pastor of a Unitarian church of long tradition.*

BY birth and training I am a prejudiced Unitarian. As Robert Collyer said of Methodism, "Dear old mother church, I can never bear to hear anybody criticise her but me."

To illustrate. An unhappy Congregationalist minister boasted to me in a railroad depot at five o'clock in the morning that a Unitarian lady had said to him that when she wanted to hear a liberal sermon she went to the Congregational church. As I did not preach in that town, it was no funeral of mine; but as a Unitarian I was never so insulted. "And what is your liberalism?" I inquired. He explained that it was the "Higher Criticism." "Lord bless you, man," I retorted. "Don't you know that all that has been an old story among Unitarians for fifty years back? That Unitarian lady was one of our awkward squad. They *always* go to your church to catch up with their A. B. C."

This was merely the beginning; and the result was in less than five minutes that Congregationalist minister was fleeing for the *smoking car* to save his life!

I am always glad to do little stunts of this kind for misguided Orthodox brethren; to whom be peace; but for misguided Unitarians my stunt is different. It is now sixteen years since I made a discovery about Unitarianism,—a discovery which has been the cause of all my joy and all my woe. Unitarianism, like Judaism at the coming of Christ, had forged a sword, but was by no means ready to swing it in the fight. i. e. We swung it over our heads and proclaimed it with joy and pride as the weapon for the good fight; but if ever a minister got up and said, "Well and good: let us march against Philip, the Orthodox world of the Elect Few and the Damned Majority!" it was noticeable that Unitarians fidgeted and whispered with white lips, "Peace, peace! It is a good world! There is nothing wrong but Theology!"

Why these fidgets, and this peace-cry when there was no peace? Curious that Unitarians had so little objection to the world they lived in! Nothing wrong but Theology! It was evident, then, that Unitarians did not object to Orthodoxy in the concrete! A brutal Calvinistic hell-heaven revolted us; but a brutal Calvinistic earth was matter for rejoicing and "optimism!" In vain had Channing turned his back on heaven and assaulted the world. Unitarians, I found, were surprised and annoyed to learn that Chaning had ever done anything so indiscreet. At any rate, it was certain that having been fairly canonized, he had no further business on earth. As for "Channing Unitarians," they were generally people who believed that Channing was a demigod who believed that Jesus was another. What did these demigods teach? Why, Channing Unitarianism, of course!

In short, Orthodox Theology was fallible—nay, damnable; but Orthodox Sociology, Economics, Politics, and other apparatus whereby the Elect keep the damned in their places—all this was infallible and perfect, ever since the Civil War. True, there was the servant-girl problem, and the temperance question, (perhaps); but happily, Unitarians did not get drunk.

Alas for this view of Orthodoxy! I realized the fatal truth of an Emersonian dictum that the Theology is just as good as the Politics and the Politics is just as good as the Business and the

Business is just as good as—I forget the rest; but the Emersonian upshot is that *it is all tarred with the same Orthodox stick!* Unitarianism never made the world in six days and rested on the seventh; nor our present "Orthodoxy" either, for that matter. "We all live in dead men's houses," as Hawthorne said. Therefore I demanded in my native dialect, "Why not a Unitarian world? The Brotherhood of Man *applied* would—good heavens, it wouldn't leave hide or hair of this applied cannibalism miscalled 'civilization!'" Glorious! It was our business, then, to make all things new!

This conviction that the whole Orthodox world, not Theology alone, must suffer reconstruction, was confirmed by the behavior of thinkers and events. Already was Orthodox Politics on the way to the scrap-heap, and Democracy, a rude innovator, was shouldering his way in; and as for Orthodox Economics, or house-law, where was *Laissez Faire* if not on the run? The Co-operative Commonwealth was at hand! The revolution that Unitarians were attempting in religion, others were attempting in every sphere of life! Orthodoxy was doomed *in toto!*

With these glad tidings I hastened before my brethren; and lo! Scratch a Unitarian and you discover a Calvinist, his faith pinned securely to the doctrine of the Elect! At least, that was what I discovered. True, we had repudiated the doctrine, theologically speaking. In *heaven,* (if there *were* a heaven), there would be no Elect, choiring eternal praises with an obligato of damned souls; but *here*—well, that was different. Here there were, and ever should be, the *best people.* As for the others, let them look to it. Human nature was—the temple of God? Oh yes, maybe; but you know what these laboring men are? What about the survival of the fittest; and Individual-Salvation-by-Character; and the poor ye have always with you? Didn't Jesus say that? Come now! Besides, look at our charities! What? Wrung out of the poor, like everything else? Young man, beware! You talk like a Socialist! Be so good as to hand in your resignation.

With these Orthodox beasts at our Unitarian Ephesus I fought after the manner of men, and fought them to a finish—my own. The beasts called me a hard-hitter; and I gratefully acknowledge the compliment; for like old Fuller, I should have suspected that my preaching had no salt in it, if no galled horse did wince. A good cure for "conscience" in these matters is to read the Bible prophets, Wendell Phillips, Channing, Parker, and Emerson,—all "hard-hitters." In cowardly times it is to such men that one must go for brave speech.

If today I am "outside the breastworks," with my "usefulness" gone, I owe it largely to the counsel of such men; certainly not to the counsel of canny Scots who, with no illusions about "our heritage of freedom," warned me of the wrath to come. Again and again have such canny but friendly Scots been good enough to say to me, "Why will you persist in this suicidal course? There is no reason why you should not succeed in the Unitarian Ministry *if you will only let social justice alone.* These radical ideas will be the ruin of you." I laughed and said, "Get thee to a nunnery! What about our heritage of freedom?" I recalled the words of Renan: "The first rule for him who has great enterprises at stake is to turn a deaf ear to the counsel of the vulgar." I turned a deaf ear, and here I am, outside the breastworks!

This may seem a small thing to Unitarians, but it is rather a large one to me—not merely because my personal case is so important, but because it is so typical. During our whole denominational history, the same conservative club has descended on every head that contained an unorthodox idea. If Channing, Parker, and Emerson were outcasts among us, what rod is in pickle for the rest of us? If they have called the masters of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of their household? Every sect in Christendom is a little classic on the old Palestinian model. I say it with sadness, but with conviction born of bitter experience: Unitarians do always resist the Holy Ghost. There is not an idea which we are proud of today which Unitarians have not persecuted and punished

with poverty and heartbreak, till the wretched proclaimers were tempted to envy their Prototype who hung only five hours on the cross. We call ourselves "Evolutionists," we moderns, but practically we do not believe in the process, but make fools of ourselves all the day long resisting the idea, the logos, the world-creator.

All this is inevitable, men say. "Without shedding of blood, no remission of sins." "To make an omelet, one must break a few eggs;" and other barbarous old maxims. And yet, one can hardly resist a feeling of contempt for encomiums on "our Unitarian liberty," "our heritage of freedom," etc., which is no sooner exercised than it proves to be the merest vaporing and buncombe. All sects, ours included, grant the liberty of their hen-coop; but the human mind is no barnyard fowl to be satisfied with such liberty. If Unitarianism decides to be a hen-coop, it will end like other sects as a refuge for the chicken-hearted.

I have been compelled to dismiss all illusions about Unitarian liberty, American liberty, and all other liberties whatsoever. Liberty is still a thing to be fought for; a widening circle of hard-won territory, conquered inch by inch and foot by foot against the ancient enemy, Conservatism.

Of course there are many valued liberties in our hen-coop. You the minister, if you are just out of some Orthodox incubator, will enjoy your freedom. You may go to the theatre, dance, play cards, and have a glass of wine or a good cigar with a leading parishioner—all with no harm done to your salary or "usefulness." Or, mounting on spiritual wings to the pulpit, you may higher-criticise, Evolutionise, or ultra-rationalise to your heart's content. You may even ultra-ritualise, and people will say, "That's harmless." You may call Jesus to account for tongue-lashing the Pharisees, and the "best people" will perceive that you are indeed their friend. On the other hand, should you justify Jesus in his anti-Phariseeism, you would probably discover how history repeats itself.

I have always idealized my congregations till the last illusion was stripped away. Each new set of upturned faces seemed so full of promise and hospitality! Here, surely, were the people of my heart—elective affinities, able and eager to hear what I was able and eager to say! And then—the old story! A man with convictions is apt to be eloquent—for *him*. "Eloquence was dog-cheap at the Abolition chapel;" and mine was always an Abolition chapel. "Let us set men free from their bitter wrongs, as we ourselves were freed by others!"—such, in substance, was my message. The noblest, (who were, of course, the people in front of me), should conspire for the deliverance of their brethren in bonds of any and every sort. Poverty, for example, so detestible to us all, and the whole infamous lot of the poor!

So I waxed eloquent on a vast and fruitful theme with its myriad ramifications. To me it was like the discovery of a continent, after being marooned on the little old island of Individual-Salvation-by-Character-of-Respectable-Unitarians; but to the congregation—alas! We read of certain gentlemen who took oath to neither eat, drink, nor shave till they had slain Paul. Well, it is a common Unitarian trick. In the Unitarian church next to mine, a leading parishioner called out his minister, convicted him of "voting wrong," and deliberately *spat in his face!* In my church they merely said, "We *suspect* that the minister voted for So-and-so. If he did, it is the beginning of the end." It *was*.

It is said that not all Unitarian churches behave in this way, and I am delighted to hear it, though I am afraid I should have to be shown. There are doubtless brave churches among us, (it would be strange if there were none),—churches that are able and eager to hear the next lesson; and these are great churches, of whatsoever size; but there are likewise *little* churches among us. And a little church is like an arch, every stone of which is indispensable; and if, as often happens, the keystone of the arch is a conservative person with a moderate-sized pocketbook, it is wonderful what he can do by way of rule or ruin! I would back such a man against the

Apostle Paul in any little church in Christendom,—if Paul could get the call.

The strangest thing about our modern heresy of Social Justice is, it is all set down in our prophets, Channing, Emerson, and Parker, just as the message of Jesus was all set down in Isaiah, Amos, and Micah; and yet, when he did but revive this cannonized word, they acted like born Unitarians! I have in my possession a friendly letter warning me of the fatal results of four conservative, kindergartenish sermons on the Social Christianity.

"Too radical—oh, by far! And all the churches are just like ours," was the verdict! Merciful heaven! And was even this pap, this milk for babes, too strong for our nursery! One actually hears this bland assumption that Mellin's food is the proper diet for our churches! But is not Unitarianism rather an elderly infant; and have we lived one hundred years to deserve Hamlet's gibe: "That great baby is not yet out of his swaddling clouts?"

It is dispiriting, to put it mildly, to be forever compelled to say "Goo, goo" to a baby; yet this seems to be the only message that some churches are willing to pay for; and the temptation is ever present to descend to this profitable imbecility and be a sort of Juliet's nurse in the pulpit. It is easy enough, and the popularity and emoluments are certain. In moments of weakness and despair, a minister is tempted to ask himself, "What's the use? I have stuck to my convictions now for years, without one ray of encouragement or one smile of favor. I have been dogged with bitter poverty and insult, stigmatized as a 'crank' and a 'failure,' and turned out of doors by the mother that bore me; and the result is—nothing! Why not give it up, and follow the easy, slovenly recipe for Unitarian 'success?'"

"It is impossible to calculate the moral mischief that mental lying has produced in society," says Thomas Paine. Yet the pulpit is constantly threatened with this mischief. In the presence of bigotry the mental process halts, stumbles, and turns traitor in all but the boldest; and we have the shameful spectacle of Christianity preached to by blind guides, time-servers, and word-mongers. The church decapitates its thinkers, and degeneration sets in and reversion to type.

Are we, (or are we going to be), a case of arrested development? I see no reason for it but one: the old argument, "I have a yoke of oxen, and therefore I can not come." In other words, we are a well-to-do people, and therefore our sympathies belong with Mammon. Is this our argument? Our future behavior will decide. We call ourselves "intelligent;" but there is more than intelligence to be reckoned with in this matter. There is emotion, feeling, the fanaticism of caste, and the passionate adoration of money which is the unconfessed religion of half America at this moment; the sickly prate of "spirituality" in a world begotten of injustice—from this infernal stew and compost, Unitarianism, like all isms, is to be delivered, Those who on safe and snug incomes discuss "spiritual" things, such as Browning, and sneer at the "materialism of the prayer for daily bread," should be sent to a coal mine for thirty days, housed in a slum, and fed on American food-for-the-masses. The survivors to be catechised by Thomas Carlyle, beginning at the question: "Wilt thou now believe in hell?"

The illusion that our modern form of cannibalism is Christianity can not long endure. Under our thin disguises, we are *eaters of men*—that is the horrid fact to be reckoned with. Our luxuries, refinements, "spiritualities," religious aesthetics, and hair-splitting dialectics are paid for with the tears and groans and blood and slavery of millions. Where are your eyes, oh intelligent Unitarians, that you can not see this gross, medieval hell-heaven actually running at full blast under your precious noses? And you are the angels!—you few, you *happy* few! And you take an occasional peek at the process and draw back half strangled to thank God for the boon of salvation! If some day these damned should storm the battlements of your scoundrelly heaven, would history bewail your doom with a single tear? Under the circumstances, we may well quote

Jefferson and say, "I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just."

I figure Unitarianism as a sleeping beauty in an enchanted Mammonistic palace, dreaming of a revolution to be made of such rosewater as Salvation-by-character! If the Prince in this fairy tale has failed to awaken the Princess in the approved Tennysonian manner, is he not justified in shaking her? She will probably wake up mad, and demand his resignation. At least, such has been her procedure hitherto; but we may confidently await the day when she will come to herself and say, "Well done, good and faithful servant. Enter thou into a Unitarian church."

I will say this for Unitarianism. You may preach everything in a Unitarian pulpit except Social Justice; and you may preach that too, if you are prepared to take the consequences. We are a people with only one heresy in sight, and that is our own religion. Is it so utterly hopeless that we shall ultimately become acquainted with that? With the Fellowship for Social Justice as master of ceremonies, I trust that Unitarianism and its religion will shortly be on speaking terms. As Wendell Phillips said, "We may come at last to be as wise as Napoleon and believe there is no power without justice. We may grow to be as good Christians as Cicero, and believe that basenses can never be expedient."

Yes, we may "come at last"; but for one, I am not content with any late denominational repentance. Now is the time to act, not by-and-by when Social Justice is popular and safe and—God save the mark!—*profitable!*

"Then to side with Truth is noble when
we share her wretched crust,
Ere her cause bring fame and profit, and
'tis prosperous to be just."

———o———

The Second Parish (Unitarian) Church in Saco, Maine, has called Rev. Paul Harris Drake, pastor of the First Universalist Church in Beverly, Mass., to be its minister. Rev. Mr. Drake has accepted the call and will begin his duties there Sept. 1.

OUR READERS' EXCHANGE.

[*We welcome to this page short communications from our readers touching any article that has been recently published in our columns, or dealing with any vital concern of our denominational activity or general religious interest. This is an "Open Court," our only insistence being that courtesy, pertinence and brevity shall be the manner of all our contributors.—EDITOR*].

MR. HOLMES IS NOT APPROVED OF.

Editor of THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE:

In his department, that of The Modern Church and Social Justice, your editorial contributor, in your June number, makes it very distinct that he believes a complete revolution of "the present order of industrial society" is indispensable; that "revolutionary changes" must be made, even in "the men and women themselves who comprise the system." He declares this sweepingly; as if complete desuetude had overtaken the once respected positive and comparative forms of expression, and only the superlative had survived;—declares that the lamentable delusion prevails that the present "system" is in all respects perfect and therefore must stand without change—"as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be"; that misguided men talk as if it were "some kind of divinely ordered institution," while as a matter of fact it is only the last of a long line of social systems, the present order, according to Dr. Lyman Abbott, whom he quotes, having begun about the beginning of the 19th century. He emphasises the erroneousness and unintelligent view the masses take of the situation; certifies, in general terms, to their incompetency; and yet, these are the very masses whom, in your May issue, he was ready to invest with all the powers of the initiative, the referendum and the recall,—with the power to recall judges whose decisions offended them—leaving to those masses, not to the courts, the final appeal, on matters however abstract and difficult.

But something in his department in your July issue rivets the attention,—his discussion of the recent Report of the Committee on The Church and the Social Question. Certain parts of that report displease him: it is not radical or far-reaching enough; it proposes no cataclismic overturning of venerable institutions, or methods to which men have become accustomed; "its tone is perfunctory rather than inspirational"; in other words, "it is a sober consideration of the expedient and the possible, rather than of the imperatve and necessary." That of course would be an offensive limitation; the objects that are possible of attainment do not satisfy at all: give us, on the contrary, something so unattainable to strive for that it is inconceivable that it can ever be actually attained! That seems like a new Idealism which classifies as "imperative and necessary" that which is neither expedient nor possible. One instinctively, for the sake of contrast, turns to thought of an earlier reformer—a reformer of sixty years ago, Theodore Parker. In temper and method he and your contributor seem to be antipodal—creatures of another age, if not of another planet. Witness Parker's scrupulous care to be accurate in his facts, to champion no cause the final achievement of which he did not regard as possible—most of whose objects did turn out to be possible. And contemplate, too, his temperate style; his entire consistency; that he never found it needful to go back and correct anything, or apologize for anything. Contemplate the momentous seriousness of his utterance; the consecration of it; the sobriety and poise of it, whether in sermon or address. Recall his appeals to history—his recognition of the fact that to change an order that has been centuries in developing time is required. Recall the method and spirit of his three hours' sermon on the Life of Webster, listening to which, as she describes it, Julia Ward Howe was detained so long after her dinner hour that her family wondered what had befallen her! Think of that, with its sublime seriousness, and consider it in the reflected light of an observation of your contributor's in this July issue; the observation in which, assuming a less critical attitude, he finally says, in palliation of what to his apprehension are its weaknesses and defects, "If the phraseology is unduly careful, we must remember that the document is not an oration, or a sermon, or a poem, and that therefore it *rightly avoids any extravagance of statement.*" But that is just what Parker avoided, in his sermons, and everywhere. Is your contributor wise, in revealing that his standard of sermonizing is different? If in a sermon he is willing to exaggerate, to overstate a fact or a situation, and so announces, as he now impliedly does—does he not shatter our confidence in himself as a preacher? With him, is a sermon a mere performance? And note this astonishing criticism on part of the report, which as a whole he finally praises: "Why should the minister 'acquaint himself with the facts of the social question' only 'as far as he can'? 'What limitations are there on his ability in this direction'" Why, of course, just the limitation named: how can he acquaint himself with a fact except "as far as he can?" But because this report does not advise him to acquaint himself with facts *farther than he possibly can,* your contributor criticizes it—says its caution in this respect is "aggravating, to say the least!" After this it should not surprise us that even his praise of the report, where he does praise it, should be misphrased. He says, "It may well be said to embody the charter of the social freedom of our churches." "Social freedom" is evidently here a meaningless phrase: there is not a church in the denomination whose "freedom" has been or conceivably can be enlarged by it. It is well to have so comprehensive a document, but it does not constitute a "charter," or enlarge any church or minister's liberty.

The quotation from Dr. Gladden on "feudalism" is not illuminating. The Doctor seems to have picked up the term as descriptive of something he reprobates, with little understanding of what it connotes. Parker would have commended feudalism, as an advance, when first inaugurated, on the complete lack of system which it displaced, but as something to be destroyed, later, when it be-

came oppressive. He no doubt would have seen, with Bishop Stubbs ("Constitutional History"), that one feature of it, the Domesday Survey, was far reaching; was "the first step in a continuous process by which the nation ultimately arrived at the power of taxing itself, and thus controlling the whole framework of the constitution and the whole policy of the government."

It seems a little strange that after eulogizing the Socialist Party in your May number, your contributor should now insist on that feature of Dr. Abbott's "industrial democracy" which advocates the "co-operative ownership of the *tools of industry* by those who use them," when, as A. Lawrence Lowell has pointed out, the Socialists themselves so far discard the complete co-operative idea as to claim that the implements of each man's industry should be owned by himself individually! Your contributor's devotion to the dogma of government ownership appeared again, in the June number, in the acceptance, as a remedy for evils deplored, of "the complete socialization of all capital, by collective ownership on a national scale and, through the *instrumentality of government,* of the means of production, distribution and exchange." This he thinks indispensable. He says, "Nothing will avail today but an utter change—a rooting out of the old and a planting of the new." This would involve the co-operative ownership of a man's implements of industry; and however deeply rooted in human nature the instinct of individual ownership may be, that is to be "rooted out," and co-operative ownership substituted! And "the men and women themselves who compose the system" are to be revolutionized; all their instincts and aspirations toward individual ownership "rooted out!" Verily, a herculean undertaking! Even where the ancient village communal systems prevailed—in India, in Germany, in England—there were allotments of parcels to be *individually* cultivated. And a curious piece of early American history is to be found in Palfrey's *New England,* Vol. I. At Plymouth the Fathers began with things partly owned in common; but in 1623 a change seemed desirable, and, as the historian says, "This year was the first in which a *stimulus of individual interest* had quickened the activity of toil. To each family, in place of the partnership labor hitherto maintained, had been assigned, in the spring, the cultivation and profit of a separate parcel of land, the single persons being each attached to some family, and a provision being added, that each cultivator should at harvest 'bring in a competent portion for the maintenance of public officers, fishermen, etc.;'" and quoting Bradford, he continues, "The plan gave very good success, *for it made all hands very industrious.*" This has been so universally the experience that if any economic principle may be said to have been conclusively established inductively, it would be this: that the instinct of the race, the working out of innate human qualities, demand the recognition of individual ownership, not only with reference to the implements of industry which a man uses in his daily toil, but as to innumerable things besides. You contributor quotes from one of his learned Doctors the sentence, "It is perilous to deny the manhood of the common man." Agreed: but in thwarting this instinctive desire to *own individually,* in striving to place all things on a co-operative, collective, socialistic basis, are we not denying that very "manhood of the common man," the preservation of which we all deem so essential to progress in the world?

Now, I cannot concede to your contributor the exclusive privilege of citing authorities, and myself desire to insert one. Mine is from the late Prof. Sheldon Amos, an English publicist and barrister, of University College, the University of London, and the Inns of Court. On this question of ownership he says:

"It is obvious that apart from the possibility of ownership, the position of a man, as a moral being, is pitiable and even contemptible in the extreme. He keeps for himself and for his own uses just so much as he is able to retain hold of, and for just so long a time as he can retain hold of it. His energies must be wholly engaged in the exercise of vigilant retention. His hand is against every man's, because every man's hand is

against him. There is no room or opportunity for speculation about the future uses to which he shall turn his possessions, nor even about any but the most obvious and simple immediate uses. There can be no play for the imagination as to the effect of protracted or carefully planned labor upon the things about him, and still less as to the consequences of regulated co-operation with his fellows. Suspicion, fear, self-indulgence, an instinctive sense of the wisdom of immediate consumption and of trusting as little as possible to the morrow, are the habits of mind generated under such circumstances, and which, in fact, represent an almost ideally savage state.

"Nor is it merely that the absence of ownership prevents the most precious qualities and elements of human nature from being properly cultured and developed. It prevents those qualities and elements from so much as existing at all. A faith in the future, a faith in others, habits of self-reliance and of forming far-sighted, deliberate and complicated plans are very hard to call into being, as they need the utmost possible stimulus of all sorts to develop them highly. But it is ownership and ultimately, laws of ownership, which perform the main function in both creating and stimulating these qualities and habits.

"If a man *owns* and not merely possesses, his imagination centres round the object of ownership, and through the medium of it he is brought into permanent and incessant contact with other persons about him; with his own future life and his modes of conducting it; with his children and successors; with all the institutions, social and political, with the validity and integrity of which his own rights of ownership are indissolubly connected. This is most especially true in the case of ownership of land and immovables; and one of the main political arguments in favour of a system of peasant proprietorship is based upon a recognition of these facts. But it is also true in respect of all ownership whatever. The recognition of ownership implies the existence of a society, however small or feebly organized; and what might be supposed to be a mere tribute to, and expression of, natural selfishness, becomes the most remarkable aid in educating men into unselfishness. * * * In a highly organized society the poorest member shares in this physical and moral grandeur with the richest."

In further developing the idea set forth, Prof. Amos later reaches the point of contemplating the end to which the benefits of ownership ought to be directed; the *uses* to which surplus profits from things owned (in the unequal division of the things of the earth which no scheme of laws or ownership can obviate) ought morally to be applied.

In contrast with impassioned appeals for the overturning of the whole existing order with not even a suggestion of how the revolution is to be accomplished or what is to be substituted, it seems to me Prof. Amos's words are wise, and deserving of careful attention.

GEO. R. BISHOP.

Aug. 1911.

———o———

To the Editor of UNITARIAN ADVANCE:

IT has seemed to me that the movement for churches in corporate capacity to engage in social reform is just as dangerous as for churches as units to formulate dogmas; both imply a binding force exerted upon the members, which if too strong may disrupt them. Policies of uniformity should only be exercised in time of great pressure: only then are they safe. To commit the church to a program of reform hampers its members, who have as much right to formulate their own beliefs in social as in theological matters. I can see no harm, however, in a church's endorsing current reforms or even aiding them, if approval is given by democratic vote, if it is understood as non-committal in the case of individuals, that the church may change its vote like any other democratic body, and that such action is a secondary, not a primary function of the church.

The church throughout its history has, I think, repeatedly filled out the gaps where the state failed to step in. These stop-gaps have changed from time to time, and each time people have said that the church's function is gone, or that it

has changed. Its secondary, not its primary function, has changed. Once the church as a church handled charity: social differentiation and division of labor is relieving it of that burden, with increased efficiency for both lines of activity. Once the church handled all government and all education. Once the church furnished the only literary pleasure for young people and women, in its clubs. It still does some of these things. It is right and socially expedient that, where such an organization exists, ready to hand, it should be so utilized; but only where such uses are needed—as they are at present in country districts. At present the cities need wholesome recreation facilities and are not yet providing them. Some churches are jumping nobly into the breach. Others are still furnishing unneeded or more efficiently duplicated services. Others are forgetting that these functions, however valuable, are only secondary activities, the necessity for which we hope may some day be quite eliminated. Let us not turn back progress by trying to identify the corporate church with activities which have or should have their own proper vehicle in other organizations to which the church members may belong.

THOMAS D. ELIOT.

LOYALTY TO THE UNITARIAN FAITH.*

By REV. F. BLOUNT MOTT.

SOME people fear that any definite allegiance to a cause will make them narrow and even bigoted. It is certainly pitiable to see people strenuously devoted to small or belittling aims. There is not much to praise in passionate devotion to billiards, to bridge, or to golf. Loyalty to a cause that asks for the surrender of reason or the stifling of conscience is deliberately suicidal. But to say this is not to condemn the quality of loyalty; it only shows that we must consider the value, the ultimate purpose and aim of any cause to which we mean to devote ourselves. If we ask, "Should Unitarians be loyal to their Faith?" we do not suggest that it follows as a matter of course, because they are called by one name, but we raise a much more important question, "Is there any inspiring purpose in their common cause which makes it worthy of supreme devotion?"

Personally, I have no hesitation in asking from every Unitarian the most emphatic and vigorous loyalty, because I believe the work we are undertaking is the noblest and grandest that has ever been set before the human race. It is to declare, to advocate, and promote religion as permanently founded in the eternal realities of life, according to the evidence of reason and the constant revelations of truth.

It is to make religion reasonable and natural. It is to advance religion out of the clinging superstitions and the blinding misconception of the past which hid its reality in an impenetrable cloud of miracle, and destroyed its living power of life in the artificial bounds of finite creeds, and to bring it out into the freedom and invigorating freshness of the light and the truth. It is to shake off the tradition which is dead and put on the reason that is alive.

For the first time in history a Christian Church, the Unitarian Church, proclaims pure Christianity. That is the heart of the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, the essence of what he emphasised as essential to religion, without ceremony, without idolatry, without baptism, without superstition, subscription, or creed. This has never been attempted before. The earliest Christian Churches in Europe, founded by Paul, enveloped, shrouded and hid the simplicity of the message of Jesus in an impenetrable confusion of thought as to the mystical, miraculous transformation of Jesus into Christ; the reality of the man Jesus, the beauty of his human words and human love, the direct and living power of his message, was lost in the dazzling conception of his death on the cross as a miraculous and redemptive turning point in creation.

Not under Luther, or Calvin, Knox or Wesley, has such a revival of Christianity been suggested as is set forth by the Unitarian Church of today. In future history our work will figure as the beginning of a marvellous change in the

*This article, reprinted from *The Christian Life* (London) will be especially interesting to our readers because Mr. Mott began his ministry with us in America.

vital power of religion over the lives of men.

This is why Unitarians should be loyal to their faith, because they are embarked upon the sure beginnings of the most splendid religious movement of any age, the realization of a universal religion, absolutely natural and capable of endless expansion, keeping abreast of the growth of human faculties and every revelation of truth. We are not joined in any precarious adventure, no temporary issue is ours, we are not a broken fragment, we are part of universal human history, we have our roots firmly set, we are grown and full of life; we can never again be less. In the past people have scorned our faith, turned from it as from an abominable heresy; even now we are considered by many to be infidels and outcasts, but a great change is perceptible; wherever there is an enlightened public the principles of our faith are having a decided influence in modifying and purifying the old conceptions.

This preliminary work is not yet accomplished; unfortunately we are still obliged to utter our protest against many things that are earnestly believed by other Christians. It is impossible to fully disclose the truth without discrediting and forcing aside the false... old land that has become foul with weeds must necessarily undergo a process of purification before it is ready for the new seed....that the world is antagonistic to the spirit, that men are born depraved, that we must be caught from the fire like brands from the burning, in order to be saved, that the Godhead is a Trinity, that Jesus died to appease divine anger, that the Bible is a unique and miraculous revelation of God's truth, and the creeds a condensed and final statement of things necessary to salvation, all these things being still upheld and taught in the name of Christianity we are compelled to deny and to denounce. We see the terrible harm these doctrines have inflicted, and still are inflicting on the thoughts, habits, and training of the race; how the whole conception of an arbitrary God, a special revelation and a fixed and standardised faith, produces a human society full of injustice, tyranny, barbarity, hypocrisy, bullying, snobbishness, a degraded sense of the sancity of human life, harshness towards children, and contempt of woman.

But the sweeping away of many delusions and much falsehood is only the rough clearing of the land. Then begins the real business of our cause. We are critics only in the most temporary sense. Our true work is not to point out errors or untruths, not to declare what we do not believe, but to arouse the human soul, asleep, dwarfed, fearful, or ignorant, to a sense of its own greatness.... to fill it with haunting thoughts of God, to flood it with streams of new life, to make it thrill with hopes and aspirations that are pregnant with new power to uplift and to bless. To bring out, and prove and make real, the great eternal mighty facts that have power to cheer and strengthen and brighten man's daily life. It is our business to show that the inborn most essential and real qualities which under the exterior habits and customs of life make a true human being, are derived from the eternal, the divine, are, in fact, sparks of life from the living God, and as such in their development naturally bring men nearer and nearer to the thing for which they were given life, likeness to their Father.

It is our business to show that the resplendent glory of Jesus lay in his discovery that the highest manifestation of God is boundless and infinite love, and that the surest and quickest way to promote and hasten the union of the human and divine is to develop in humanity the flickering spark of this divine capacity into a glorious stream of fuller light.

It is our business to show that natural, simple, and immediate means are present everywhere for any human soul to take part with its Creator in creating itself, that no soul is finished, that God supplies us with the necessary material, hopes, emotions, ideals, difficulties, trials, and joys, by which we can add to the stature of our spirits, enlarge our lives, and grow in fulness of divine being.

It is our business to open before all men the unbounded fields of progress now and here towards richer, nobler, grander life. To lead to God by invok-

ing the God-like, to gather together the poor, the despised, the fallen, the sinner, the wise, and the ignorant, and to call them all to look up and behold their Father, to come to themselves, and return to Him, to be worthy of the inexpressible glory of their natural inheritance as living children of the Infinite and the Eternal.

Without miracle, without creed, without ceremony or sacrament, but in reason, simplicity and love it is our business to press on towards no other goal than that set by Jesus, "Ye therefore shall be perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

To what cause should anyone ever be loyal, if not to this? To what cause shall men ever be asked to give their heart's love, their soul's joy, their whole life's power, if not to this? I believe that nothing so real, so great, so true, has ever been presented to men's minds and hearts. I earnestly believe that humanity is ready to receive it, that the civilized world is weary of the vast incubus of things impossible to believe in religion, of miracle dogma and the superstition, which dim the reality of living truth, and that the time has come when humanity is ready to take a great forward step in religion by advancing from the specially revealed the miraculous, the incredible, to the universal, natural and real——Already, wherever the truth for which we work, pure Christianity enforced and confirmed and enlarged by modern knowledge, is most alive; wherever Unitarian influence is strong, there the spirit of freedom, justice, friendliness and education, progress, and good citizenship are also strong. Far more than we can yet imagine it will achieve when it is understood, accepted and developed, and it is to this end we ask that Unitarians should be loyal. Our faith is the link between human and divine, between creation and its consummation; by loyalty to it we consecrate ourselves to the Eternal, to our Father and our God.

———o———

—Rev. George E. MacIlwain, of Middleboro, Mass., has accepted a call to the pastorate of the church in Toledo, O., as successor to Rev. A. M. Rihbany.

RELIGION IN HAWAII.

By E. S. Goodhue, M. D.

IN the preface to a letter by Richard H. Dana, Jr., published in the N. Y. "Tribune" in 1859, on "The Sandwich Islands," the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions says:—

"That mission" (to Hawaii) "was instituted in the year 1820; and in 1853, thirty-three years afterwards, the Board formally declared those Islands Christianized, and the appropriate work of the Board, as a foreign missionary society, completed.

"Indeed, it has been actively engaged since 1848, in bringing its work on these islands to a close.

"It divided the property it there held among the missionaries, to enable them to remain with their children, released them from their formal connection with itself, and encouraged them to become Hawaiian citizens. Had the Sandwich Islands been a territory of the United States, the Board might have transferred the remaining work to the Home Missionary Societies existing under different names. But that not being the case (nor even desirable), and the native community not being able to bear the entire support of its foreign ministry in addition to its other numerous burdens, nor yet able to dispense with it, there has been and still is a necessity for the Board to render a considerable aid in sustaining the foreign clergy; leaving the native clergy, the church building, school houses, common schools, the native high school, the making of roads, and of course, the whole machinery and working of the government, to be sustained by the people."

In 1863 the Board decided to sever its connection with the work in Hawaii, sending its secretary, Rufus Anderson, to arrange for the placing of native pastors over the churches. This final separation was formally announced at a public meeting held in Honolulu in 1870.

In 1863 the Hawaiian Society of Foreign Missions which had been in existence since 1850, was changed to the Hawaiian Evangelical Association, which assumed the care of native churches, and

the direction of missions on some of the South Sea islands.

In 1827 a French ship came to Honolulu with two priests and four laymen, for the purpose of establishing a Roman Catholic mission in Hawaii. Contrary to law they landed without a permit from the King, whose objection did not prevent the French captain from sailing away again without the priests. So a temporary place of worship was set up and attended by some of the Roman Catholic residents, and a few natives. However, upon investigation, the King decided that this new religion being "almost like the idolatrous religion he had discarded," was not good for his people, and so forbade any more services. After more or less trouble, the priests were sent away, but in 1839 the French frigate "Artemise" arrived with more priests, demanding "the admission of priests and toleration of the Roman Catholic religion throughout the islands."

This privilege being granted a little later, a Cathedral was erected in Honolulu, and missions were established at various points on other islands. The new religion took fairly well. The novelty of the ritual and its ornate worship appealed to the undeveloped and primitive sense of the native, but gradually even this began to pall upon his emotional nature. Now, if he is religious, it is largely after the Congregational manner. Aside from small country parishes, schools, and the humanitarian work of the Sisters of Charity on Molokai and elsewhere, the Roman Catholic field in Hawaii remains restricted.

A bishop of the Roman Catholic Church who was asked what he thought of the permanent work of his Church among the natives, laughingly replied—"Oh, we educate them like the other churches do, and like them succeed in making greater rascals out of the natives." This was merely a way of acknowledging that all the religious teaching had not influenced the life and character of the native to any great extent. That he no longer indulges in human sacrifice, polygamy or infanticide, is more due to *law* than to a change in his nature. He has never taken his religion seriously, and to a painful degree he is superstitious and unmoral. So the hopes which Mr. Dana entertained in 1859, while based upon apparently good grounds, have not been realized in Hawaii:

"It is not difficult to see that the Roman Catholic Church, with its open doors, free sittings, daily mass and vespers, its corps of teaching and visiting nuns, its sacramental system, its worship addressed to the mind and heart, through the eye and the ear as well as the word to the understanding, with its service which gives a part to all, and especially its system of commemorations and in the modern sense its 'spiritualism' of angels, and departed saints was strongly enlisting the almost vacated native faculties." The "plain naked buildings" which were and are the native meeting-houses, the preacher "dressed in tweed-sack coat of the shop," the simple Congregational service, have continued to attract the larger part of the native population who go to church at all.

In 1859 the King and Queen through the British Consul and by private letter to Queen Victoria, asked that a clergyman of the Church of England be settled in Honolulu as chaplain of the royal family, agreeing to contribute towards his support, and in 1861 T. N. Staley, D. D., was made Bishop of Honolulu. With the establishment of the mission, and until the departure of Bishop Willis, when the Hawaiian Church came under the jurisdiction of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, there was a great deal of bitter feeling between the American Congregationalists and English Episcopalians.

"The Bishop refused to recognize the American mission," says J. M. Alexander in his book, "and publicly gave thanks that 'at last the true religion had been brought to Hawaii.' They obtained a small following of Englishmen but almost none of the natives. They have been sustained chiefly by money sent from England." (1895) Bishop Staley says in *his* book:

"Of the English in Hawaii many were partizans of the South—but the majority of the Americans were from New Eng-

land.—Still the American Congregationalists continued to reiterate the oft-refuted assertion that 'Bishop Staley was only an emissary of the London Foreign Office, sent out to secure the annexation of the Islands to the British Empire.'"

Naturally such a feeling stirred up the bitterest animosities, and kept many out of the Episcopal church. Later, under Bishop Willis who was a loyal Briton, perhaps rather unyielding in his attitude, there was feeling over the dethronement of Queen Liliuokalani and the vexed question of annexation. Happily, all these dissensions have been dissipated with the changes induced by time and the wise administration of Bishop Restarick, Yet, a realization of the expectations of Mr. Dana are as far off as ever:

"The missionaries of the Church of England, in all parts of the globe, bear earnest testimony to the special value of the Liturgy in making the natives actors in the worship. The prayers, creeds, anthems, confessions, thanksgivings and plain chanting of familiar psalms, the responsive worship between pastor and people, make the service truly a common worship, enabling all to be actors in it as well as giving variety. Another deficiency which the Ritual supplies is the system of commemorations. One of the missionaries told me he had long thought that changes must be made in their system in the direction of the Ritual and Liturgy of the English Church."

It is undoubtedly true that the natives like to be actors or participators in the worship, but merely to respond in a formal way, to sing with others and to chant psalms, does not appeal to them. They much prefer to be able to get up and "exhort" in church; to attend large conventions where delegates wear badges, and where there is ample opportunity for public speaking—opportunities frequently afforded by the Congregationalist system. Their conventions, Sunday-school associations and informal religious meetings in which the native layman can participate, are common, while in the Episcopal Church all but the minister are pretty well excluded.

This free-and-easy participation more than offsets the ritual and liturgy of the more formal service, and, in some measure at least, accounts for the native's adherence to the simpler missionary forms. The work of the Episcopal Church is confined largely to its American and British membership, in Honolulu and in the outside parishes. There are a few schools—The Priory, a boys' school in Honolulu, attended by Hawaiians, but the Church has only a small number of Hawaiian communcants. Indeed, wisely I think, no effort seems to be made to interfere with the work of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association whose native churches are established in all the towns and villages of Hawaii, as well as in sparsely settled places in the country. Here are churches and Sunday-schools with a resident native pastor, and a supervising pastor in charge of a number of native churches. Despite all the effort, the frequent conventions and religious picnics, it is easy to see that attendance upon the churches is diminishing fast, and that the natives are losing interest in religious work.

The Mormons who came to Hawaii a few years ago, have established a few unimportant missions to which "boy" missionaries are sent from Utah. Their work is good, I think, in its influence, but not large or likely to increase.

Other denominations represented are the Methodist with a church in Honolulu, the Christian Church and Christian Scientists both in Honolulu.

The Central Union in Honolulu, is the old Congregationalist mother-church, with a large, wealthy, and influential membership. It includes most of the well known American families in the city, is active in philanthropic, Settlement, Sunday-school, and social work. The minister, Doremus Scudder, a New Englander, is a physician as well as a clergyman, and a man of modern views on theology and sociology. A large proportion of his membership is in agreement with him in his religious work. In a late issue of the "Friend" of which Dr. Scudder is editor, he says upon a subject entitled, "Basis of Church Membership":

"Throughout the Mainland, churches of every name are rejecting creeds as un-

worthy and unchristian shibboleths by which to determine discipleship, and are substituting simple confession covenants in their stead. In doing this, they are returning to the days of the Apostolic Church.—The early churches of New England were all organized with like simple covenants.—The creedal era is sure to pass in these islands as soon as the age long spirit of liberty, seen first in the Apostolic Church, cherished throughout all the centuries of Christian history by the free churches, revived with power through the Protestant Reformation, and now becoming regnant, gets hold of the minds, hearts and consciences of the disciples of the Lord."

Later, an effort was made at Central Union to do away with any creedal test for discipleship. The church at Kahului, on the Island of Maui, adopted as a basis of union a covenant of which the following is a clause:

"Solemnly confessing my faith in the Fatherhood of God, affirming my belief in the Brotherhood of Man, and sincerely acknowledging the leadership of Jesus and his spirit as the ruling principle of my life, I do now enter into covenant with this church."

Of this Covenant the Bishop of the Episcopal Church writes in his "Hawaiian Church Chronicle:" "A casual reading of this will lead anyone to see that one who denied the divinity of Jesus Christ could become a member. Disbelief in the divinity of Christ is a common thing among the Union churches of these islands, and when we say this we are prepared to give the names of people who frankly stated this to the writer or others. Puritanism by its remorseless logic, and its tendency to intellectualism, has led and leads to a gradual loss of faith in the facts of Incarnation. It is seen in New England, it is seen here. Not long ago, talking to a Churchwoman of Missionary stock, she said, 'After I was confirmed I visited the house of Rev. ——— in Hawaii, he attacked me with bitterness for my action. Two years later he was in the Unitarian ministry. Now we are not assailing Unitarians or any one else.

"Some of our best friends are Unitarians. What they or any one else have of grace in them is of Christ. But we affirm that denial of Christ as God or minimizing the positive statement of this truth, leads to disintegration and decay in corporate Christianity. A creedless church would be a chartless ship. It would be like a society without reason for its existence. It would be like a man without a soul. The purpose of the creedless church is to allow the admittance of those who do not accept Jesus as the Christ-the anointed of God, the one who revealed God because he *was* God."

The white or foreign population of Hawaii is made up of Americans, descendants of Americans, British, Germans, some French, Scandinavians, and a sprinkling of other nationalities. With the exception of a few converts, the Chinese and Japanese are adherents of their own ancient religions. The French, the Portuguese, Porto Ricans, Filipinos and a few natives are Roman Catholics. This leaves the mass of the church-going foreign population divided up between the Congregationalists and Episcopalians.

At least one-third of the members of Central Union Church are liberals, or, as our Episcopal friends would term them, "intellectuals." How many liberals are to be found in the Episcopal Church the Bishop himself could not tell, but to my knowledge some of his very best members are practically Unitarian. Many of the best known and ablest men and women in Honolulu are Unitarians in belief if not by profession. Among these are an ex-president and governor, ex-attorney-general, ex-chief justice of the Supreme Court, Superintendent of Forestry, editor of daily newspaper, two or three physicians, and others.

So far as I know there has been no attempt to teach or preach a liberal faith to the Hawaiians. Even in the Congregationalist missions, the doctrines inculcated in many of the outside districts are orthodox enough to satisfy Bishop Restarick himself—salvation through the blood of Jesus, hell fire, all the literal interpretations of fifty years ago.

It is probably thought not expedient to introduce a practically new faith through the old channels. It might perhaps be putting new wine in old bottles. While most of the overseeing pastors are liberal —one of the most able outside of Honolulu has expressed himself to me as Unitarian in all essentials—some of them are narrow and orthodox. They are here for the present to tide over a period, but it will not be long before they outlive their usefulness even in Hawaii. I believe that a religion of the spirit—such as Dr. Scudder preaches; a religion which demands a consistent life as a *sine qua non;* a religion like present-day Unitarianism, warm with the love of the brotherhood, rich in activities of an adequate sort, constructive, and having for its object the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth, would, in time, be accepted by the native, and prove much more of an influence for good upon his life and conduct than have any of the religions he has so far experimented with. The Doctorage, Hawaii.

———o———

NEW BOOKS.

LIFE IN THE MAKING. An Approach to Religion through the method of Modern Pragmatism. Loren B. Macdonald. Boston. Sherman French and Co., 1911. Net. $1.35.

This little book by the minister of the First Parish, Concord, Mass., is of real value in relation to present phases of religious feeling. It is fresh and suggestive, clear in thought and diction, a book to set one thinking on fruitful lines. It should especially appeal to thoughtful laymen and it is well if half the preaching in our churches is as sane, clear-eyed and direct in thought and temper. The aim of the book is not unfamiliar to our communion, to approach religion from the near end, to emphasize its roots in and its values for human living, to present "the religious life not as a dogma but an invitation," to express "religious trust and aspiration free from cant phrases and conventional assumptions." It is an aim that animates many sincere souls in all communions today. It finds more or less clear expression in such books as the sermons of Dewhurst and the works of President King. The power of this book lies in its pellucid honesty. We feel that we are in contact with a wide-awake, virile spiritual nature profoundly stirred by the needs and hopes and possibilities of humanity. Mr. Macdonald has chosen a very suggestive title. The suggestion is, of course, that life in all its manifold expressions is not a finished product. The returns are not, as the writer expresses it, "all in." This is at once a sobering and a hopeful fact and because the fact has not been recognized and emphasized as it deserves our theologies and, we might suggest, our social sciences also, have largely failed. The watchword of the older liberalism used to be "Not the creed, but the deed." The newer and better thought makes a significant enlargement of this when it declares that not dogma but character of life puts meaning into the world. Religion is the line of approach, the open door to the highest values. The life that now is contains the substance of religion but that is only true when we acknowledge that life is in the making. Our author would begin by asking, How much religion can we find in what we see, handle and experience? Whereas the older method declared that religion must chiefly be found in what we do not see. That this method of approach to religion through life in the making is more needed today and promises to be more fruitful than in the past is undoubted. We have never had the materials for such a treatment. If thought is to make use of experience in the spiritual realm, experience must be so wide and deep and strong as to be almost impersonal. Perhaps we do not yet know enough about the making of life to plot its spiritual curve and for a long time yet must follow humbly the olden prophets.

Nothing can be more admirable than Mr. Macdonald's use of this difficult and hazardous method. It is both firmly founded on actual realities and humanly tender and sympathetic with dissent. The interest is genuine; the illustrations of thought unusually good, original and illuminating. There is a kind of dramatic sequence, a real progression in the chap-

ters. Life begins, he tells us, in a natural simplicity, an unconscious well-being. It is disturbed by questioning and thought but this is rationalized. Life is "under orders"; it grows and gains by sharing. It breaks the old home ties to be reborn into nobler and more spiritual manhood and material objects fail to minister to its deepest needs. Again life can only be wholesome and healthy by mental and moral exercise. "The potency of thought over phyiscal conditions has a religious value." Life is strengthened by faith in its own ultimate trustworthiness. Life creates and recreates through its purposes, its visions. Underneath it are unmeasured reserves of unconscious being. Life is in partnership with something beyond itself and is re-enforced from that deeper ocean men call God. Finally, life, grown aware of its own mysterious greatness and worth, life sufficiently unfolded, will be triumphant even over the shadow of death.

This is but the meagre outline of a worthy piece of work, an honor to our fellowship. It is valuable not so much in its persuasions as in the illuminations, the side-lights it throws on many a dark place in human nature, its vigor and manliness. One feels a certain reserve in it, a fear of saying too much. This is perhaps inseparable from the method and purpose of the book. But it is tantalizing. It is not quite fair. It is as though the racer were held back from showing what he might do. The undogmatic temper is right, is fundamental. But when it leads us to make a bogey of Dogma and perhaps flirt a little with Agnosticism, it is not so well. The world insists on asking not how little but how deeply do you believe. No doubt it is a stupid world, but may not the instinct be God-given? There are hints of this in the book. In so far as pragmatism is applied common sense it has large uses but as an "ism" it is no better than other isms. It can test results but can it bring about results? It can tell whether our eggs are stale but has it brought them forth? It seems to the present writer that life is bigger than any estimate of its value, and Mr. Macdonald's religion much cramped by the ligatures of his theory. Is not our modern religion afraid of itself, fearful of being self deceived? Is it not in danger of understatement? It is well to be led to the door of the Temple, but we want to hear the music and song. C. J. S.

—o—

The Church of Tomorrow; by Joseph Henry Crooker, Boston: The Pilgrim Pres. 280 pp. $1.00 *net.*

Of course "The Church of Tomorrow" in any man's mind is simply his ideal of what the church ought to be. The church as it is at present meets no man's ideal, entirely; he has his definite criticisms and positive dissatisfactions; but tomorrow—perhaps—may make all these things right and bring about a realization of what one thinks ought to come to pass. Only there are as many "Tomorrows" as there are different points-of-view among the prophets.

Dr. Crooker's ideal of what the church ought to be, (*ergo* "The Church of Tomorrow,") is sincerely, earnestly and effectively set forth in this well-made volume:—and on the whole it is all sane and convincing. He deals with "The Method of the Church: Diversity of Form with Unity of Spirit;" "Its Task: Feeding the Roots of Life;" "Its Thoughts of God: The Tap-root of Religion;" "Its Worship: The Fruitfulness of Prayer;" "Its Pulpit: The Voice of the Moral Ideal," and "Its Pews: The Congregation at Work," in six extended, sober, forcefully written, and comprehensive chapters. The writer is a Unitarian, and the publishers are the official publishing-house of the Congregational (Trinitarian) denomination, but no least incongruity is occasioned by these facts. For as we all know, the publishing-house of the Congregational denomination is now in the control of its more progressive wing, while Dr. Crooker's Unitarianism is not exactly radical. Moreover this book has little to do with theologies; going back rather to the more essential things that lie behind theologies and polities,—the spirit and motive of the church ideal. And his dominant thesis is fundamentally sound; the business of the church is to conserve the moral and religious ideal in the hearts of men: to fortify and develop character,

and to bring to focus the supreme dynamic of the inner life,—first in the souls of individual men, and then in the commonwealth of society, through the instrumentality of the rationally organized and properly inspired institution of religious energy and inspiration which has gathered about the name and tradition of Jesus. Dr. Crooker is temperamentally conservative; and specifically devout. He has little use for "Socialism," which he, almost painfully, shies at, "Pragmatism," which he absurdly misunderstands, or "Psycho-Therapeutics," which is of little account, anyway; he is insistent on an avowedly Christo-centric mode of religious development—(though he would not use that phrase, preferring rather the "Supremacy of Jesus")—and many Unitarians would not find his vocabulary always congenial to their taste. Some of the things he emphasizes would receive but scant attention perhaps were some younger apostle of Unitarianism writing in his stead; while as assuredly in such a case would certain aspects of religious development imminent in the coming "Tomorrow," which he has scarcely touched upon, receive more vigorous treatment by other hands.—But then, undoubtedly, "The Pilgrim Press" would not have been the publishers of the volume. In any case Dr. Crooker's book is well worth while; some of his points of emphasis are deeply significant; the substance of it all is preeminently wholesome, if not progressive; and it will do much to strengthen the habit of "together thinking" amongst the average people of the two branches of Congregationalism at any rate in New England, which is surely all to the good.

LETTERS TO A MINISTERIAL SON: by A Man of the World. Boston: The Pilgrim Press: 222 pp.

One may read quite far into this volume (at any rate we did) before discovering,—what the publishers nowhere confess,—that it is of English origin, and only "imported" for American readers. On the whole this rather adds to the interest. It is significant to discover how much in common we share with English church people of the minor problems of our work, and the little points of difference add a somewhat baffling element of wonder to the casual reader. Certainly the Man of the World is a very practical minded, and level-headed sort of layman, and we hope his ministerial son, after making the proper discounts, made good investments in the light of these "tips" to success. Some of the things written about are "The Call to the Ministry—Fool or Hero;" "Concerning the Thirdly—Pastoral Visiting;" "On Pulpit Politics;" "On Church Cranks," "About Bazaars and Side-Shows;" "Amusements and Things," "Concerning the Collection," "Matrimony," "The Minister's Sunday: Golf or?" "Why men don't go to church, and why they do." "On 'Making a National Reputation,'" and the like. The point of view is liberal—though safely so, and we suspect,—but then why have suspicions? That Man of the World would at any rate make a good parishoner for any young minister, English or American, orthodox or liberal.

———o———

—We have received with much delight, after long anticipations, the new revision of "UNITY HYMNS AND CHORALS" edited by Drs. W. C. Gannett and Frederick L. Hosmer. It is too early yet to present an adequate review, which we reserve for our next issue; but it may be of interest to our readers to quote these words from the Preface: "Our hymns reflect the religious feelings underlying what is called the Liberal Faith—feelings of moral longing and consecration, of dependence on the One in All, of child-like trust in the Eternal Goodness, of happy thankfulness for life, of free communion between man and man in brotherhood, and between the child-soul and the indwelling Father-soul..... There is more than the usual proportion of herald-songs,—songs of the Good-to-be. More, also, than is common, of hymns touched with the sense of wonder and beauty of Nature,..... Songs suffused with the thought and feeling, without the name, of God, will be used increasingly as "hymns" we think." The book is published by the Unity Publishing Co., Chicago, and is on sale at all our denomination book-rooms, we hope, without exception.

OUR NATIONAL SOCIETIES

With headquarters in the building of the *American Unitarian Association, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.*

Local offices at 104 East 20th Street, New York City; 105 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and Cor. Franklin and Geary Streets, San Francisco, Cal.

The American Unitarian Association

Founded in 1825.

The chief missionary organization of the Unitarian churches of America. It supports missionaries, establishes and maintains churches, holds conventions, aids in building meeting-houses, publishes books, tracts, and devotional works.

Address correspondence to the *Secretary,* Rev. Lewis G. Wilson.

Unitarian Sunday-School Society

Founded in 1827.

Maintained by the Unitarian churches to promote religious and moral education. Publishes manuals and tracts, issues a Sunday-school paper, holds conventions, carries on a book-room.. Branch at 175 Dearborn Street, Chicago.

President, Rev. William I. Lawrance.

Treasurer, John H. Edwards.

National Alliance of Unitarian Women

Organized in 1890.

Promotes the local organization of the women of the Unitarian churches for missionary and denominational work.

Address correspondence to the *Clerk,* Miss Florence Everett.

Address contributions to the *Treasurer,* Mrs. Lucia Clapp Noyes, 11 St. John St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.

Young People's Religious Union

Organized in 1896.

Promotes the organization of the young people of the Unitarian churches for "Truth, Worship and Service."

Address correspondence to Miss Grace R. Torr.

Address contributions to the *Treasurer,* Mr. O. Arthur McMurdie.

Practical Boys' Camp

at moderate rates; tents, canoes, athletics, mountain tramping. Gregg Lake, Antrim, N. H., July and August. Rev. W. A. Wood, West Upton, Mass.

DANFORTH SCHOOL

FRAMINGHAM, MASS., on 200 acre farm, midway between Boston and Worcester. A home school for twenty boys under sixteen years. Moderate tuition. Address Box 25. **JAMES CHESTER FLAGG, A. B., Master.**

Proctor Academy

ANDOVER, N. H.

A Unitarian School for both sexes. In the foothills of the White Mountains, 100 miles from Boston. Pure water. Bracing air. Separate Dormitories. New Buildings. Five Courses,—College Preparatory, Scientific, English, Business, Agriculture. Elementary Work. College Certificate privileges. Free Tuition to ten students. Gymnasium. 10 Acre Athletic Field. School Farm of 100 Acres. $250 a year—no extras.

For catalogue, address,

THEODORE PARKER FARR, A. M.

Principal

Hackley School

TARRYTOWN, N. Y.

Rev. SAMUEL A. ELIOT, D. D., President of Trustees

FALL TERM OPENS

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20

For Catalogue Address

WALTER B. GAGE, Headmaster

The Meadville Theological School

(Established 1844)

MEADVILLE, PA.

Trains men and women for a liberal and progressive ministry

For catalogue address the president,

F. C. SOUTHWORTH

ALL QUESTIONS ANSWERED on DEFINITE INQUIRIES

AS TO FURNISHINGS AND MEMORIAL GIFTS FOR THE SACRED EDIFICE AND THE CEMETERY

Send for Illustrated Handbook and Data

J. & R. LAMB

Studios 23-5-7 Sixth Ave. New York

For What Do Unitarian Churches Stand?

FOR the religion of the spirit, as distinguished from the religion of authority, whether of pope or book, of priest or synod. They accept "truth for authority, not authority for truth," and believe in the never ceasing revelation of God to man in all lands and ages.

For freedom of thought and word, believing that freedom and truth go ever hand in hand. Therefore they do not attempt to prescribe the belief of either their ministers or their laymen, nor do they fear diversity of opinion as incompatible with unity of spirit.

For the fuller realization of the divine in the universe and in the heart of man. They believe that God is Infinite Spirit, the source of all life and truth, and that something of the nature of God may be apprehended by study of humanity, and of the world about us.

For belief in the divine humanity of Jesus, because they hold that all souls are children of the Infinite Spirit, and that the divine sonship is a universal manifestation, not a unique phenomenon.

For civic reform, economic justice, and social regeneration, believing that the mission of the church is now and here to establish the divine commonwealth of love and peace on earth.

For eternal life,—not merely another life of blissful ease, which we shall discover beyond the grave; but life which already lays hold upon immortality because it is even now in harmony with God's divine order.